



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>









THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS:


THOMAS G. APPLE, D. D.,
Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster Pa.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D. D.,
Lancaster, Pa.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

91 S. 17
VOLUME XXXIX.

PHILADELPHIA ·
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE,
CHARLES G. FISHER, Proprietor.
907 ARCH STREET.
1892.



NOV 23 1909



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JANUARY NUMBER.

| ARTICLE | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. WHAT IS THE BIBLE? By Prof. Thos. G. Apple, D.D., LL D. | 5 |
| II. "YE ARE COMPLETE IN HIM." By Rev. S. N. Callender, D.D. | 20 |
| III. THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. By Rev. W. Rupp, D.D. | 34 |
| IV. THE TREND OF HISTORY. By Rev. J. B. Rust, A.M. . . | 64 |
| V. PERSONAL CONSECRATION TO CHRIST. By Rev. J. G. Noss | 93 |
| VI. SUNDAY OBSERVANCES. By Rev. F. K. Levan, D.D. . . | 106 |
| VII. SIMON BAR-JONA; THE STONE AND THE ROCK. By Mrs. T. C. Porter. | 117 |
| VIII. NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS | 138 |

APRIL NUMBER.

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. CHRIST'S MIRACLES IN RELATION TO HIS PERSONALITY. By the Rev. Eml. V. Gerhart, D.D., LL.D. | 147 |
| II. CALVIN AT HOME. By Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D. . . | 163 |
| III. DID CHRIST SUFFER IN HIS DIVINE NATURE? By Rev. Cornelius R. Lane, D.D., Ph.D. | 173 |
| IV. THE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS OF SCOTLAND AND THEIR NEW SERVICE BOOK. By Rev. William Frederick Faber. | 193 |
| V. CAN OUR PRESENT MODE OF PLACING PASTORS BE IMPROVED? By Rev. A. E. Truxal, A.M. | 204 |
| VI. THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT. By Rev. John Alfred Faulkner | 223 |
| VII. THE COMING IDEAL CHURCH. By Rev. A. A. Pfanstiehl | 235 |
| VIII. SIMON BAR-JONA; THE STONE AND THE ROCK. By Mrs. T. C. Porter. | 254 |
| IX. NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS | 271 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JULY NUMBER.

| ARTICLE | PAGE |
|---|------|
| I. THE DIVINE-HUMAN PERSON IN CHRIST. By Prof. Thos. G. Apple, D.D., LL.D. | 277 |
| II. ORIGINAL BUDDHISM. By Prof. E. V. Gerhart, D.D., LL.D. | 291 |
| III. SAMUEL GULDEN, PIETIST AND PIONEER. By Rev. J. H. Dubbs, D.D. | 309 |
| IV. THE PENTATEUCH. Reviewed by H. P. Laird, Esq. | 326 |
| V. CHRIST'S HEADSHIP AND SONSHIP. By the late Rev. S. H. Giesy, D.D. | 363 |
| VI. THE MYSTERY OF EVIL IN THE NATURAL WORLD. By Rev. Samuel Z. Beam, D.D. | 369 |
| VII. JESUS CHRIST, THE GREATEST REFORMER. By Rev. A. S. Weber, A.M. | 389 |
| VIII. CHRISTIANITY A LIFE. By the Rev. Ambrose M. Schmidt | 407 |
| IX. NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS | 414 |

OCTOBER NUMBER.

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM. By John Stahr, D.D. . . | 421 |
| II. THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. By the Rev. Talbot W. Chambers, D.D. | 437 |
| III. MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM. By Rev. A. A. Pfanstiehl | 461 |
| IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OBJECTIVE AND SACRA- MENTAL IN CHRISTIANITY. By Rev. J. W. Love, A.M. | 473 |
| V. THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF SACRIFICES. By Rev. D. B. Lady, A.M. | 487 |
| VI. HYMNOLOGY AND MUSIC IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. By Rev. J. M. Schick, D.D. | 504 |
| VII. CHRIST'S ESSENTIAL SONSHIP. By the late Rev. Samuel H. Giesy, D.D. | 522 |
| VIII. SIMON BAR-JONA; THE STONE AND THE ROCK. By Mrs. T. C. Porter. | 536 |
| IX. NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS | 556 |

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1892.

I.

WHAT IS THE BIBLE?

BY PROF. THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

THE Bible is *the Book*. This title, which it has acquired for itself the world over, implies that it is unique as compared with all other books. It is the book in a preëminent sense. The first construction that might be put upon this title is, that it is the book containing the record of a religion, the Christian religion. As the Vedas contain the religion of the East, or the Koran the religion of Mohammed, so the Bible is the authority for the religion of Christ.

But upon closer inquiry we learn that there is a higher sense in which the Bible is called the book, just as Christianity is not only a religion among other religions, but is the only absolute religion. As religions in general claim to be based upon some revelation of truth, whether through natural or supernatural means—that is, whether through the natural genius and intuition of some mind, some great man, or through some divine agency—so Christianity claims to be based upon the only absolute revelation. It claims to contain the truth as

revealed in a supernatural way to man from God from the beginning of the world, and culminating in the revelation in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Other religions are the expression of the natural religious intuitions of man, projections, as it were, of his natural religious wants, and therefore mere forms without substantial contents. It may, indeed, be allowed that there are intermingled in these religions some elements of a primitive revelation made to man, but lost as to its substance through the lapse of the nations into unbelief. St. Paul says of those nations, called the Gentiles, that they *would* not retain the knowledge of God in their hearts, and that therefore God had given them over to the blindness of unbelief. As distinguished, then, from the books of all other religions, the Bible contains the one only true and infallible revelation which God has made to the world.

One peculiarity of the Bible is that, as the revelation it records was a progressive revelation, so the Bible is composed of sections, or books, that were prepared by different authors and in different ages. Criticism has not even as yet satisfactorily settled the precise time when each of its books was written, but it is known that the whole time extended over a long series of ages, reaching from the time of Moses to the closing years of the first century of the Christian era. "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in a Son," *i. e.*, one who occupies the relation of sonship. The record kept pace with the revelation. What God revealed in various ways, as in theophanies, dreams, &c., was preserved in tradition, and handed down in different writings. These writings did not pretend at any one time to contain the absolute fulness of divine revelation, but only what was made known at the time, and in the measure, or degree, in which it was made known. Not until this revelation reached its absolute fulness in the incarnation of the Son of God, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, was the record closed as complete and final.

It might be inferred from what has now been said that the recorded revelation contained in the Bible would be characterized by the circumstances of the times in which it was produced. The revelation itself would be thus affected, and consequently its apprehension, reproduction, and record, would necessarily share in the same modification. God could not reveal Himself in any greater degree than men were prepared for the revelation. Hence in its first stages this revelation would appear as imperfect and crude to a later age. The world had a childhood, youth, and mature age, just as the individual man has. No other religion claims to have a revelation of such continuous character, one and the same, from the beginning of the world. The fact that Christianity alone claims this raises the presumption that it really possesses such a revelation. Where else would such a claim come from if not from the fact itself, the actual existence, of such a revelation?

We are now prepared to consider what we may designate the fullness or completeness of the revelation contained in the Bible. It is at once evident that such fullness or completeness cannot be predicated of any one portion of the Bible taken by itself. Such part cannot be complete simply because it is a part and not the whole. The absolute revelation was made by, and is contained in, the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the *whole Bible only* can contain the record of this revelation in its wholeness, so far at least as such revelation of a living person *can* be given in the form of the written word. We must grant that even in its wholeness the Bible is not commensurate with the revelation in Christ, but we can say that for human apprehension all is given in the Bible which it is necessary for man to know, for the purposes for which the Bible was given. In this sense we may say that the revelation recorded in the Bible is complete.

The question may be raised here, whether there is any revelation made by the glorified Christ, in addition to, or over and above, what is given in the Bible? and if so, in what sense? No one would say that any book, or myriad of books, could

contain all that is revealed in the divine-human person of Christ. And yet, when that mystery is recorded by inspiration, as by the writers of the Bible, may it not contain in substance the whole truth of revelation, and that what remains now is simply the development of the apprehension of that mystery, on the basis of what is revealed? Even those who were confronted by the person of the Lord could not apprehend the fullness of His person, yet the confession of Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," contains the substance of the absolute revelation.

The Bible, then, we may say, is a complete revelation. Hence it is closed as *the sacred canon*. The books it contains have been determined and fixed as differing from all uninspired writings. There is a difference, indeed, between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant church as to the number of inspired books in the Bible, the former including the Apocrypha, the latter excluding it. But the completeness of the Bible does not necessarily depend on the mere fixing of the number of books it contains. We know that at least one of St. Paul's epistles has been lost, and yet this fact does not detract from the wholeness of the Bible. And so, if an epistle were now discovered, it would not add to, or change, the wholeness of the Bible, because we know of a surety that it would make no change substantially in what is given to us in the Bible. We cannot say that it was absolutely necessary that St. Paul should write just so many, and no more nor less, epistles. The New Testament would not lose its wholeness by the omission of the epistle to Philemon, by which we do not mean that important and necessary truth is not contained in that epistle. But we may believe that the church, to whom the revelation was entrusted, preserved this revelation in its wholeness, and that the Bible contains the whole revelation of God to man.

When we say that the Bible is a closed canon, we mean that the revelation our Saviour gave to His disciples was the whole revelation He designed to give to man in that form. That, indeed, is one of the characteristics of the apostles, that to them

was entrusted the whole revelation He designed to make. For this purpose they were called to be personal witnesses of His life, and for this end they were specially inspired to apprehend and make known the revelation. In order to have any additional revelation, it would be necessary to have another inspired apostolate; in short, another opening of the New Testament dispensation, with miracles, charisms, and all that belonged to that opening. The New Testament is, in a sense, the perpetuation of the apostolate in the church. The apostles were the inspired teachers in laying the foundation of the church, and of this we may say, "No other foundation can be laid than that which is laid." The church is still inspired in a general sense, and inspired talent and genius may discover new truth in the Bible, and make it known, but no one may be expected to reveal new substantial truth, because the apostolate is past. The apostolic age was unique in this respect, and it will not be repeated. The *Irvingites*, we know, sprang up as a sect some years ago in Europe, and based themselves upon the idea that the apostolate is to be continued. They appointed apostles, (just what was not done in the apostolic age, for it was their peculiar characteristic that they were appointed directly by Christ, except in the case of Matthias, and it is particularly stated that he was a witness of the life of Christ) and aimed to continue their sect on that basis. But this sect has ceased to exist because it was based on a fallacy.

This, then, is what we mean when we say the Bible is a *closed canon*, in answer to the question, What is the Bible? It is a completed book, and therefore it is, as the Reformers held and Protestants now hold, the complete and only infallible rule of faith and practice.

In taking this position, do we detract from the infinite and absolute fullness of the glorified Christ? Is He not more than the Bible? and must not that revelation which advanced in stages in times past continue to go on as the Church approaches its own glorification? In answer we would say, that revelation was progressive down to the coming of Christ, but He was and

is the end of revelation, and His Word is in a sense Himself, and when He gave us His last word, He Himself closed His own revelation until He come again in glory.

It follows, then, that while the revelation in the Bible is objectively complete, yet subjectively in the mind of the Church the revelation given will reach new and higher stages of apprehension. And this, we know, is sometimes called new revelation, for, it is said, revelation implies a making known, and therefore that which is not known, or apprehended, is not revealed. But we must make a distinction here between a revelation as *subjective* and an *objective* revelation. Christ had fully revealed Himself when He ascended up on high, that is, as an objective revelation, but that revelation was not fully apprehended subjectively by His disciples. In this subjective sense revelation is still progressive, whilst nothing new is added as to the substance of what is already revealed.

An illustration of this difference appears in the revelation in the Gospels as compared with the Epistles. The Epistles are subjective. They unfold the truth contained in the Gospels, but they add nothing to the substance of the Gospels. *Weiss* maintains, we know, that the Gospels are quite as subjective as the Epistles, and that, therefore, the Epistles are a higher, a more advanced revelation than the Gospels. This is true in a sense, but the Gospels make known to us what came from without, from Christ, His words and works, and in this sense, even though they are a reproduction,—that is, the deeds and words of the Lord passed through their thinking,—yet it was not with the writers of them as it was with the writers of the Epistles. The revelation given in the Gospels is objective as compared with the Epistles. In this sense no new revelation can be expected. If such revelation were given now, it would have to be by the private illumination or inspiration of the individual to whom it is made. But this, in the nature of the case, could be only for him and not authoritatively for others. There would be no witnessing to the objective, as was the case with the Apostles. The only apparent exception to this is in the case of the

Apostle Paul. The glorified Saviour did, indeed, appear to him and make revelations to him, but the Saviour did not make anything known to him which He had not made known before to the other Apostles, and, therefore, even St. Paul did not present anything new. He merely claimed equality with the other Apostles, and for that he had a miraculous call. What was new was not any additional general revelation, but rather his personal call to be the Apostle to the Gentiles.

Swedenborg claimed to have a special illumination to reveal what cannot be otherwise understood from the Scriptures; but although he thus appeals to the Bible itself, yet even his claim cannot be accepted unless he can attest it by a miracle, or something that would give him Apostolic authority. We may repeat: a mere subjective revelation, if such were made to an individual, would be of force, it may be, to himself, but it could not be authenticated to another, or become authority for all men.

On this account, doubtless, the Bible contains not only revelation contemporaneous with the writers, but as it goes back to the beginning of creation, so also it goes forward to the close of human history. There are prophecies as yet unfulfilled. As if to indicate that what is therein recorded covers the whole ground of revelation, and therefore nothing further, as to substance, or objective, is to be looked for, the New Testament ends with the mysterious apocalypse of St. John, and the words it uses in relation to that apocalypse may be applied to the whole Bible, viz., in regard to any one adding to, or taking from, the words of this book. While, then, we can look for no further prophecy, yet we may look for new and higher apprehension of the prophecy there given, and the revelation in the Bible will finally be found to cover the whole field of eschatology, as well as all other portions of revelation.

The Bible is the Word of God. That is the best definition that can be given to it. "My words," says Christ, "are spirit, and they are life." The Word of God is living and energetic, and "sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, even of the joints and marrow, and

is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” As the Word of God it partakes of the life of the Incarnate Word, and it will stand forever against all its foes, because He from whom it emanates continues to live, the same yesterday, to-day and forever!

THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE.

One of the principles of the Protestant Reformation was that the inspired Scriptures are the only infallible and supreme rule of faith and practice. Because of the adoption of another principle, viz., justification by faith alone, there was some danger already in the time of the Reformation that the first principle here named might be jeopardized, as, for instance, when Luther claimed the right to sit in judgment upon the teaching of some of the inspired books of the Bible. Is there any danger now that the supreme authority of the Bible may be imperiled by the position taken by a number of able thinkers that Christian Consciousness in general is the ultimate test of the interpretation of the Word of God? Let us see. It lies in the very idea of inspiration that the Scriptures were written under a special guidance of the Holy Spirit. We do not pretend to define this inspiration any further here than merely to say it was special. The Apostolate was ordained as the special guide of the Apostolic Church, and their teaching is now contained in, and handed down as, the New Testament. Hence while the Apostolate, as such, ceased to exist after the Apostolic age, its succession as a teaching and guiding authority is now and for all time to be found in the New Testament. To say that Christian Consciousness is an infallible and ultimate test of the interpretation of Scripture is to exalt it to an equality with the inspiration of the Apostles, and this at once would be to deny the special inspiration of the Apostles. It may be said, indeed, that the office of interpretation is not the same as that of original teaching, and therefore the special authority of the Apostles to teach may be granted, whilst the Christian Consciousness may claim an equal infallibility in interpreting their writings. But this is a mistake,

for the moment infallibility in interpreting the Scriptures is attributed to Christian Consciousness, such consciousness is placed on an equality with, if not above, the authority of the Apostles. For this is just the error of the Roman Church on this subject,—that it places the Church above the Scriptures, and makes the Pope their infallible interpreter.

But who is to interpret the Scriptures if not the Church? Certainly the Church is to interpret them; there is no question on that point. The question is whether, at any given time, its interpretation is infallible and therefore final, and thus precludes correction. If it is not final it is not infallible, and there may be a succession of consciousnesses, one correcting another. And that is just what we behold in the *progressive interpretation* of Scripture. The Scripture remains ever one and the same, but its interpretation is constantly advancing more and more to the full measure of the truth.

But whence, then, comes this higher guide in the interpretation of Scripture to lead the Church on to higher apprehension of the truth, or to correct it when it becomes wrong? We answer, it comes from the Scripture itself. It is its own light constantly to guide in its own interpretation. There is a spirit in the Word of God that guides in its interpretation, and just this is the meaning of its *abiding inspiration*. This inspiration, as in the Apostolic age, is ever above the ordinary inspiration of the Church, and this is what we mean when we assert that the Word of God is the only infallible rule of faith. It may seem strange to say that the Scripture is both the rule and the interpreter of the rule, but we assert the same thing when we assert that Christianity is at the same time the highest truth and the highest authentication of the truth. No light outside of Christianity, whether in natural reason or science, can add anything to its own authenticating power. And so we may say that Scripture is both the truth and at the same time the highest authentication of the truth—in other words, its own interpreter. This progressive interpretation comes out in various ways, through different individuals. In the Reformation it was

through the inspired genius of the Reformers over against the Christian Consciousness of the age, but it was the life and spirit of the Word itself that illumined their pathway in their interpretation of the Scripture.

It may not be easy just at once to grasp this truth, but it is not difficult to see that Christian Consciousness is not infallible or final. It has changed in its interpretation of Scripture, and is constantly changing. To make it the ultimate test, or criterion, is to fall into the Roman error, with the difference that there the Pope is the organ, while here the Church as a whole is the organ.

Of course the Church is always guided into the truth for salvation, but the point here pertains to the authority that is to correct rising error, and this, we maintain, comes from the Word of God, just as the Apostles were qualified to be the special inspired guides in their day.

It might seem pleasing to think that the Church is infallible, but perhaps its fallibility is designed to teach it the infinite value of striving to attain unto the truth. The individual believer is fallible, and it seems to follow from this that the collection of believers may err. But the Scripture is given as the infallible guide so that it may recover itself from error and return to the truth. Hence the great importance of holding to the supreme authority of the Word of God. It has been the safe guide in ages past, and it will guide the people of God safely in all time to come, provided it is held to be the only infallible rule of faith ; but overthrow this principle, and Protestantism, like the Roman Church, will be in danger of falling into error, from which another Reformation will be necessary to recover it to the truth. Let the Reformation words be inscribed on her banner : “ *Verbum Dei in eternum manet.* ”

THE SCRIPTURE AND THE WORD OF GOD.

It ought not to be necessary to say that all Scripture is not the Word of God. It does, indeed, contain the Word of God, but it contains also much that is not the Word of God. The

Book of Job, for instance, whether we regard it as veritable history or poem, teaches a great truth; it contains words from the Lord in regard to the great lesson taught by the life of Job, but it contains also the words of Job's three false comforters, and the words of Job himself, and all four characters failed to grasp the truth in regard to the purpose and meaning of Job's afflictions. It may be said, any intelligent reader will make the distinction between the words of the Lord and those of these four characters in the book; and yet we have heard intelligent ministers preach sermons on the words of those comforters as the inspired word of God. Even Satan's words, "All that a man hath will he give for his life," have been quoted as containing an inspired truth. Much of the Old Testament is composed of the history of a chosen people. That history was under divine direction, and, therefore, reveals the will and purpose of God; and yet, that history also reveals the will and purpose of man as well. Much of it exhibits the weaknesses and failings, the unbelief and disobedience of the chosen people. The concubinage and polygamy of the patriarchs, Jacob's deception of his brother Esau, the slavery permitted by Jewish legislation, we are not to attribute to God, but to man. Even where divine permission was given, it was, in some instances, because of man's weakness, and not because it was the best. Of course God would not give any sanction to what is positively sinful, yet, inasmuch as the Jewish theocracy maintained civil government as well as religious government—a state as well as a church—many things in the civil order had to be tolerated just because of the imperfection and short-comings of the people. Christian nations at the present day maintain large armies and tolerate many things that are not fully in accord with the law of God, because no government in this world can be perfect. Now it is not always an easy matter to separate in the Old Testament between the human and the divine. Certainly such men as Robert Ingersoll, and others like him, show a great deal of obtuseness in attributing in any sense to God the shortcomings and sins of God's people. But Christians

often stumble at such things, particularly in regard to the Jewish government legislation.

The same distinction must be made in the New Testament. True, the record is inspired, yet that record itself informs us of the faults of believers. And we know that even the teaching of a Peter, a Paul, and a John, though free from error, yet cannot in the nature of the case be equal in all respects to the words of our Lord. They exhibit different types of the truth, and no one of these types alone is as full as the teaching of our Lord Himself. This compels us to distinguish between grades of inspiration. We feel at once that the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are the Word of God in a sense that cannot be claimed for certain other portions of the Scripture. St. Paul might be mistaken in his chronology, counting 430 years from the promise made to Abraham to the giving of the law, and yet this would not affect the inspiration of his teaching in the doctrines of the Christian faith.

“But where will you draw the line?” it is said, if you begin to make such distinctions. In answer, we reply, we have seen that in some cases such distinction most assuredly must be made, and all that is required is that common sense and intelligence must be used in interpreting the Scripture. In making a revelation God assumes that it is made to intelligent creatures, and, therefore, He does not reveal science, chronology, &c., subjects that man can acquire a knowledge of by his own research, except incidentally, but confines His revelation to supernatural truth which man could not know of himself.

It is the province of the Higher Criticism to determine such questions as the authorship and age of the different portions of Scripture and the relative importance and authority of the different sections, just as the lower criticism has to do mainly with the purification of the text. Great fears were entertained when Bengel and others began the study of the text by comparing the different MSS., and when first the thousands of various readings were brought out, many people feared that it would destroy all proper faith in the Bible as the Word of

God? but we know now that the result has been healthful. This faith has in no wise been lessened, but it has become more intelligent. And so the Higher Criticism must produce equally good results. What though rationalists use it against the Bible? So did Strauss and Bauer try to invalidate the truth of the New Testament, but their attack only served to bring out a better and stronger defence of the gospel of our Lord. Much yet remains to be learned in reference to the Bible, and the more we learn of it the more impregnable will its position become in the faith of believers in Christianity.

THE PROGRESSIVE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

This last remark leads us to present some remarks on the progressive interpretation of Scripture. We have seen that the revelation contained in the Bible covers the whole period reaching from the beginning to the end of the world, the whole of human history. May we not say that its interpretation will cover the same period? There are prophecies that relate to the last things, to the second coming of Christ, the end of the world, the resurrection and the general judgment. Certainly these prophecies will receive a fuller interpretation as these events come to be fulfilled. We stand related to them much as the Jews stood related to the first coming of Christ, and there is some reason to think that our conception of the last things, and our understanding of the prophecies relating to them may be as imperfect as was the understanding of the Jews in regard to Old Testament prophecy relating to Christ.

But in relation to other portions of the Bible also we may believe that very much yet remains but imperfectly understood. We have mastered but a small portion as yet of the mysteries of the natural creation, and are not the mysteries of the new spiritual creation far deeper than those? Truth is life, and life cannot be limited to the apprehension of the logical understanding. Even when it is understood properly in a limited degree, there are still greater depths to be sounded.

Take some of the familiar parables of our Lord relating to

the last things, the parable of the Sheep and the Goats and of the Ten Virgins, have we yet exhausted the meaning of those parables? In the parable of the Sheep and the Goats, it is said, all *nations* shall be gathered before the Judge of quick and dead. The word *ethne*, nations, generally means *gentiles* in the New Testament. Does this parable refer to the judgment of the Gentiles only? or what bearing has it on the judgment of the Gentiles? And the Ten Virgins, does the parable refer to a final and absolute separation, or only to a share in the first resurrection?

Take the words of our Lord, "This is my body," only four words, and has the Christian Church settled on their full meaning? Were they not purposely given in this form in order that progressive interpretations might be put upon them? The Latin Church, we know, gave them a meaning in harmony with their external conception of Christianity as a whole, whilst Protestantism gives them a more spiritual meaning in harmony with its more spiritual conception of Christianity and the Church. Then the two sections of Protestantism, the Lutheran and the Reformed, divided mainly on this issue, and they are not yet united. *Must* not divine revelation be progressively apprehended just because the Church is more and more prepared for deeper apprehensions of the truth?

We believe this idea is too much overlooked by ministers, as is manifest by the tendency with many to seek for topics for sermons in the world, or passages that are unusual and strange, as if the old passages and text have been exhausted, and nothing new can be brought out of them. Even if the meaning, objectively considered, is not new, yet the apprehension of the minister may be new and fresh, and that will communicate itself to the hearers.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

From all that has now been said of the Bible it is evident that the mere literal and grammatical interpretation of Scripture does not exhaust its meaning. This, indeed, is requisite as a

basis, and it is of the utmost importance in this point of view. All the labor expended in criticism of the text and its grammatical interpretation, is necessary, but beyond this the spirit of the interpreter must penetrate deeper than this in getting into the mysteries of revelation. As some men are gifted with natural genius, so some Christian interpreters are gifted with a sanctified genius, or spirit of penetration, in spiritual things. Learning goes with this, but faith is more here than mere learning; we mean faith as the organ to apprehend supernatural realities. It is not by any externally constituted organ; not by committees, or synods, or popes, that this deeper meaning is reached, but by organs gifted by the Holy Spirit. Such mind will be in sympathy with the general Christian consciousness, and often express such consciousness, but it will often also lead the general mind, and correct the general mind of the church. As in the Reformation certain portions of the Scriptures, such as Romans and Galatians, and certain texts, such as "the just shall live by faith," yielded new truth especially on the doctrine of justification, so we may expect new developments of the church hereafter to be ushered in by new truth from the Word of God. What an incentive we find here for a faithful study of the Scriptures! Should not Biblical Exegesis and Hermeneutics stand at the front in theological study for theological students and for all ministers of the gospel?

II.

“YE ARE COMPLETE IN HIM.”

BY REV. S. N. CALLENDER, D.D.

THE question is sometimes asked, “Is man in his natural state a son of God?” Exegetes are not at one in their answers to this question. There are passages of scripture which, in the opinion of some, would require an affirmative answer. Notably, the parable of the Prodigal Son. Whereas, on the other hand, the general tenor of the New Testament would seem to limit the predicate to those who have attained sonship in Christ Jesus. He is spoken of as the Elder Brother of those only who in Him are reconciled to God; and they are sons by adoption. This would seem to involve the fact that as He is the Elder Brother (if in the full sense of the term brother), they must be partakers in common with Him in the life and nature of the Father; and that “adoption,” unlike our ordinary legal conception, must involve the idea of birth. So that prior to this new birth the sonship spoken of in scripture as predicable of man in virtue of his creation, must be taken in a modified and lower sense. For if the exegesis of the parable of the Prodigal Son be pushed to the details, and the sonship of the younger be taken in the literal, natural sense, then in its application to spiritual relations, must the being created anew in Christ Jesus be construed as a mere legal, or at best, moral change. The adequacy of this exegesis will depend altogether upon our conception of Christianity as a merely moral, or a spiritual and vital constitution.

But the true solution of our question is not reached by the affirmation of either of the above views, to the negation of the

other. As in the case of almost all contentions, there is truth on both sides. As already said, sonship involves a participation in the life and nature of the Father. St. Paul teaches that in God "we live and move and are." God did not create man, nor for that matter the whole universe, as the potter forms the vessel, which abides thereafter a separate and independent thing. Man as created is not a self-existent being, but exists solely in virtue of the indwelling—the upholding and sustaining power of the life and nature of God. This is equally true of the animal kingdom. But in each order the divine is immanent in the measure of its capacity for its reception. God abides in the order of nature, in the form, as we are accustomed to call it, of impersonal reason. He upholds and sustains it, and its laws and forces are but the manifestations of His will and energy. When we consider the vital realm, even in its lower order—the vegetable—we find the divine indwelling in fuller and larger measure in the form of organic life, and it bespeaks His presence in its bounty, its beauties and its manifold glories. In the animal world we read in clearer lines a higher, fuller presence; in the dawnings of rationality and the scintillations of will power. And this in growing measure of fullness, from the border line of the vegetable kingdom on the one hand, to the confines of humanity on the other, each in the order of its physical endowments and its vital capacity. All these in their ascending order, prophesying and adumbrating, that perfected temple for God's intended abode in man, created in full in His own image, as the adequate organ for His manifestation.

In all the orders below man we discern the unconscious, unintelligent and irresponsible instruments of God's pleasure and purpose. They are the passive organs of His revelation. The divine is immanent in them in the form of reason, and as thus in a measure being partakers of the divine, sonship, in a low and qualified sense may be predicated of them. But being destitute of an ethical nature, they are inadequate—have not the capacity for the indwelling of the divine in its fullness. But man as gifted with conscious personality, with a moral no less

than a rational nature, is the living temple adequate to and intended for the indwelling of the divine nature. In common with the lower orders, man is by creation the shrine of deity in the form of reason, and had it pleased God to enter into and become immanent as *the good* in his ethical nature, he would thus have been raised to the realization of his ideal. But this would have been to overwhelm man's self-determining power, and to have ignored his ethical nature—it would have been to make him the passive organ of His pleasure, morally irresponsible like the orders below him. As created, man was the tabernacle of the divine reason, but in the endowment of will, he at first was the unfilled receptacle for the divine as *the good—the righteous—the holy*. This, however, could enter in only in accordance with the law of free will—in answer to its free choice. This effected, then would there come to dwell in man the divine in the fullness of the Godhead. Then would man realize the fullness of the idea of Sonship. This realization would necessarily be progressive. The divine would flow in, in the measure of man's developing capacity, as we conceive the divine to have filled up the measure of the enlarging capacity of Christ's humanity, as He grew in stature and wisdom; until at last in the glorification—in his completed fullness, man would have realized the ideal of sonship.

We conclude from this, that the scriptural idea of sonship can be reached only by a new creation in Christ Jesus. At the same time man is a son of God in virtue of his creation, but this, upon the same plane, but of course of vastly higher degree, with the lower orders of creation. But the idea of sonship, and the extent of the divine immanence in man, is worthy of a most earnest and more extended study.

Christianity is the ideal of humanity. It is the goal towards which humanity is soteriologically advancing, and having reached it in its final glorification, it will realize the idea which was in the mind of God when, in the counsels of eternity, He said, “Let us make man.” To arrive at a true conception of humanity, and grasp the comprehension of its contents, no logical

definition or analysis, even though divinely inspired, can meet the necessities of the case, or be, indeed, intelligible, except as it is met and apprehended by a rational human consciousness. In like manner in the case of Christianity, no formulation of its meaning and contents can ever avail for a true knowledge of it, unless there be at hand its actual existence, in the personality of the inquirer. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." Where there is the divinely-wrought ability to do the work of God, there only is the capacity for knowing and comprehending His revelation.

The existence, then, of the vital principle of Christianity in the soul of man is a condition precedent to his ability to know it and grasp its idea. This principle is lodged in the soul by the regenerative agency of the Holy Ghost. But this, in the soul as corrupted by sin. In this disorganized bosom it exists at first as the mustard seed and as leaven, awaiting on the one hand its own proper enlargement, and on the other the transformation of the whole inner man into its own image. This, as is well understood, is what is theologically denominated sanctification, and involves a process which can reach its completion only in final glorification. Meanwhile the soul in the midst of spiritual conflict, and only gradually emerging from the darkness of ignorance, is incapable of reaching a full and clear consciousness of the divine efficiency working within. Its apprehension of it at any stage of the development can be but partial, and can be in full measure only when the process itself is completed. It is the office of the inspired word to shine into the soul through the beclouded avenue of faith, and thus open the way for an enlarged apprehension of the divine power working within. But what is this inspired word—what but the verbal delineation and recorded description of the living word? It is then the living word, shining through the written word which enters as light into the regenerate soul and awakens it to a clearer and growing consciousness of the indwelling truth. In the incarnate Word we have the living manifestation of Christianity. In Jesus Christ we have the actualization of all that

is contained in it, in living concrete form, and only as we are in vital union with Him can we ever reach its true idea. As a study, then, if we would know the significance and contents of Christianity we must turn to Him; and in attaining to which knowledge, we reach the measure, the constitution and the contents of *humanity*, "for we are complete in Him." *

With the postulation of these premises we proceed to the consideration of the question, What is involved in the Apostle Paul's idea of our completion in Christ Jesus? Did he mean to say that, in His equipment for and fulfillment of His office as Redeemer, Christ had made all needful provision for the salvation of man, and thus would discourage recourse to any other agency? or was there not present to his mind the conception of a constitutional defect in man—a deficiency which vitiated his nature and disqualified him for his intended destiny? And that in Christ this deficiency was provided for and supplied, and thus completed the true idea of humanity? Not that this latter conception excluded the former, but that both existed in his thought in full harmony.

It is not unusual to view Christianity under a two-fold aspect—as *completive* and *redemptive*—as presenting complementary sides of the same glorious truth. The latter, which is pre-eminently Pauline, considers man as a sinner, and is concerned primarily with the provision made in Christ Jesus for his deliverance from the power of sin and death. The former is Johannine, and bestows its thought principally upon man in his constitutional being and relations.

Protestantism, as Pauline in its theology, has from the beginning contemplated the redemptive side of Christianity—as the power of God for the salvation of the soul. It regards man as helplessly under the power of sin, and its primary question ever has been, what are the instrumentalities of grace for his deliverance from this bondage. Finding these to be of purely divine origin, its theology has unduly emphasized the divine factor at the expense of the human. It accepted the traditional anthro-

* Col. 2: 10.

pology and doctrine of sin, which were propounded by the Alexandrian theology, which held that the image of God in which man was created, involved the completion of his being, and that sin was simply a weakening of his powers, to be overcome by the agency of an outward divine educational help; and that room was made for this help by the interposition of the incarnation, sufferings and death of Christ, as a satisfaction for the guilt of sin. Although the Reformers theoretically discarded this Pelagian view, and held that the wages of sin was death, yet in consequence of the one-sided emphasis placed by modern theology upon the divine means of salvation, it practically holds that man is constitutionally whole, requiring only a deliverance from the *effects* of sin, leaving him as redeemed upon precisely the same plane of his natural being that he was before. This reduces sin to a legal complication, requiring only a legal adjustment for its remedy. Hence arose the prevailing views, that there can be no forgiveness of sin without a legal satisfaction, and that this satisfaction made by the Saviour, is accounted to the credit of the repentant sinner; and that from thenceforth he is enabled by the aid of an *influence* wrought by the Holy Spirit, to rely by faith upon Christ's merits and conform his life to His precepts.

This view, it will be readily perceived, degrades the incarnation to the condition of an expedient, devised to meet the necessities of an emergency which arose in the fact of sin. In other words, had not man sinned, there would have been no incarnation, its occasion being simply to provide for a suffering atonement. This view also in reality denies the vital element in the mystical union, as also the immanence of the divine in the human. Then, while having much to say of the intimacy of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the soul of the believer, yet making it, as it does, an *influence* merely, wrought by even a tactual closeness of relation, withal in reality an objective relation, it falls into the general category of Deism. Man is saved by forces acting upon him from without, and thus redeemed, he is completed without the increment to his nature of any positive element

which he did not possess while in a state of sin. So that the incarnation, sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension, bringing no vital addition to humanity, they only remove hindrances and disabilities out of the way. Was this all that was in the Apostle's mind when in the language of the text he declared, "Ye are complete in him?"

Modern theological thought is coming to be more and more deeply impressed with the inadequacy of this view. It is protesting against it as degrading our Lord Jesus Christ to the status of a means to an end; and it is insisting that He is the Omega no less than the Alpha in the creation of God. It is felt that a one-sided emphasis has been placed upon the redemptive side of Christianity, and thought is now being turned to the complementary, the completive side. In doing this, we must seek to contemplate Christ, as also man, from a Johannean point of view. That is, what they are in themselves and in their constitutional relations, the one to the other. As St. John contemplates the Logos in His relations to the Godhead and to man, anterior to the fact of sin, so we must seek to consider man in his constitution and relations to God, as he came forth from the creative hand.

God created man pure and good, and in His own image. This last, that is the divine image, we take it, has primary reference to man's spiritual nature as a personality. It implies, however, at the same time, that there was in his whole constitution a perfect adaptation and vital affinity in all the powers and organs of his being for the office to which he was ordained, as the shrine and organ for the indwelling and manifestation of the divine essence and glory. Its normal activity depended upon the immanence of the divine essence. All its parts and functional activities were shaped with reference to this end, and he may be said to have been, *potentially*, a completed being. But potentiality implies development, growth; and this implies in turn the necessity of causal conditions. Moreover, these conditions must be of such nature of adaptability and homogeneity as to enter into organic union with the life. Mere outward contact

will not meet the necessities of the case. This is true in case of man's physical and intellectual life, it is pre-eminently true of his spiritual life. Man then in his creation was endowed with all things necessary for the realization of the teleology of his being, *but* all this, conditioned by his voluntary reception of those things which needs must enter into his constitution as conditions, in order to realize his idea as a completed organism. In *so far*, Adam was complete when he became a living soul.

In his creation, Adam's will was void of contents. Its powers of free self-determination were at hand, and it remained to his will to choose its love—its rule of action—its contents. The constitution of his being presupposed, and its normal action demanded a definite order of contents as the law of its action, just as the stomach constitutionally demands a congenial and correlative content. He had the ethical power to elect that which would have been to him the good, and to reject the bad. Had he chosen the good, his being would have been perfected—complete; but choosing the bad, his whole being became disorganized, and the end of his being was, unless redeemed, defeated. This good, which the nature of his will demanded, and which he ought, in truth to himself, have chosen, was not simply an ethico-intellectual code for his actions, but a homogeneous entity, which as his love should enter into union with his life as its nourishing, energizing force, and as thus received become the spring and support of his being. This good was the only good—it was God. Only thus could man attain his ideal—only thus become complete.

When man failed to choose the good, lacking the necessary condition of his normal well-being, he fell under the power of death. That is, he was helplessly cut off from the realization of his higher being. Having rejected the only means by which his life could be perfected and confirmed, there was left him no means of self-recovery. No activity of his remaining powers could ever compensate for this loss. No latent principle within him could ever develop into a cure. The principle of the divine life had been rejected, and, as a consequence, the fact of eternal

life, and he was dead. The error of the old Greek theology, in likening sin to a disease, which the natural life, aided by educational medicaments, might overcome, was, that it mistook the indwelling of the divine reason, which is immanent in all created existences, be they good or be they bad, for that divine indwelling which enters through man's ethical nature, and which alone is unto completed being and everlasting life. Sin is a disease, an abnormality, a disorganization, but, in the absence of an underlying vital principle, it is none other than death and hell commenced here on earth.

Sin, then, is something more than a disease, with the possibility of recovery by the force of a vitality lying back of it—than a mere weakening of man's moral and spiritual powers—than an ignorance simply, to be overcome by education. It is all these, *but these as the results* of a want of that vital union with the divine nature which is to come to man through the avenue of the will, and which alone is the power of an endless life. There is vastly more Pelagianism and, indeed, refined Deism in our popular theology than many ministers of the Gospel are aware of, in consequence of their failure to trace to their logical results views which perhaps they themselves proclaim from the pulpit. It is these low conceptions of sin, and the consequent defective notions of the necessary remedial agencies, that cause the Church to be looked upon as a mere human association—that leave the sacraments to be invested with their efficacy by the subjective experiences of the recipients—that see no material difference between regeneration and conversion, and that rely upon sensational methods, rather than upon the divinely-appointed ordinances of grace, to win souls to Christ. Let it once come to be well understood that sin means *death*, and that regeneration means a *new creation* in Christ Jesus, and the means of grace appointed by Him will no longer be held as of second-rate importance as compared with methods of human device.

Christ announced the supreme purpose of His mission into this world when He declared, "I am come that ye might have *life*." This was the capital desideratum under which man la-

bored, as over against his estate of death. What man needed was not merely the negative benefit of deliverance from the penalty of sin, but the positive good of elevation to his right organic relations to God. And thus the realization of the ideal of his being, to which he had never as yet attained. To this end did Christ enter into union with our fallen humanity and completed it. His human nature was the organ for this completion. As its capacity for reception developed and enlarged, did the divine essence enter into it in organic vital union, and actualized the idea which existed in the mind and will of the Creator. This union of the divine and human would have taken place had not man fallen into sin. It must have taken place. But whether in the precise form in which it transpired, we do not know. Man was created as the organ for the manifestation of the divine. The structure of his being presupposed it, and anything short of the designed indwelling was to leave it *unperfect*—incomplete. We may suppose that the Son of Man came, to at least the temporal culmination and corresponding consciousness of this union with the fullness of the Godhead, upon the occasion of His baptism, when the Spirit of God descended upon and abode—remaining on Him. We are not to suppose that that was designed as a mere heavenly testimonial to assure the faith of the Baptist, but that the Divine Spirit abode with Him in such sense that St. Luke was warranted in speaking of Him as "being full of the Holy Ghost," and to call forth the voice "from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased"—thus indicating a consummation of union with the Father, which did not in like measure of fullness exist before. So that He could in unfaltering phrase declare, "I am in the Father and the Father in me."

In the incarnation we have the prototype of the union with the divine nature to which the believer must attain. Not that every individual will be an incarnation in the same measure that Christ was; for in Him dwelt not only the fullness of the Godhead, but equally the fullness of humanity, generically, and the believer stands related to Him as the branch does to the vine.

But that, by virtue of the new birth and the mystical union, we become in Him united with the Godhead, so as that, like unto Him, each one in his own measure is in the Father and the Father in him. This not only frees the child of God from the penal consequences of sin, but raises him out of and above the fact and estate of sin itself. Christ came not only to save the soul of man from perdition, but to take away the sin of the world. The deliverance from death and hell is a consequence, a necessary consequence indeed, but not the primary factor in redemption. This factor is involved in the union of the soul with God, which is effected by our mystical union with Christ. The incarnation, then, is the point of contact—of union of the divine nature and humanity. Its actualization in the person of Christ is the basal principle—the fountal source of life and salvation to the world. From thence must go forth every saving and redeeming efficacy, and to this, as to a common centre, must every spiritual activity turn, as to its producing cause.

From this general view of the subject, the question may arise, what is the significance, and wherein holds the necessity of the death and sufferings of Christ? Why might not the incarnation have availed at once and immediately for the completed salvation of man? A little careful thought will make it apparent, that this is to ask in other words that other question, Why did not God at once bring to an end the whole order of earthly existence and human history? Why did not God make perfect sanctification to synchronize with regeneration? We are not authorized to say that He could not have done so. For we are told that when the end does come, the believers then upon the earth will "be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." But when Christ became incarnate, God's creative purpose was not yet accomplished—His ordained order of human history had not yet reached its goal. If then this history and this purpose were to move forward to the accomplishment of their infinitely wise design, it must be along the lines and in accordance with the laws both physical and ethical which their constitution and adaptations demanded. If man was to

live in this world as man, he must do so in obedience to and in accordance with the laws inwrought in his nature. The humanity which was taken into union with the Divine nature of Christ was not a humanity *de novo*, but the humanity of Adam, broken and disorganized by sin. Now as disorganization and abnormal action in case of all sentient existences involves pain and suffering, and in case of moral creatures, penalty, this disorganized humanity carried in itself the necessity of suffering, and this could be surmounted only as its cause was exhausted and overcome. The divine entered into the human as leaven, to gradually permeate it and transform it into its own image. Meanwhile the human in process of being transformed, experiences the bitter effects of its broken law. Thus was it that Christ must needs suffer—He must be made "perfect through suffering." The disorganization and imperfection of the humanity He assumed, entailed it upon Him. And He must overcome this imperfection, and at the same time vindicate the righteousness and justice of law whose violation inflicted the suffering, by exhausting the penalty in the way of endurance.

This thought may be made clearer by a simple illustration, even though it be but partial. While we do not accept the notion of the Greek theologians, that sin is but a disease, we conceive that the *effects of sin* may be compared to the effects of a disease. In this view we employ sickness and its attendant weakness and suffering as an illustration. Take the case of typhoid fever, where its victim has gone down well nigh to the confines of the spirit world. At this point we will imagine an arrest of the disease. The vital principle within may now again assert itself. But what is his condition? Free indeed from positive disease, and the vital principle delivered from the consuming fires of fever, but his whole system is weakened and disorganized and his powers abnormal in their action. There opens before him a tedious, painful pathway of convalescence. He must pass through all the pains, privations and sufferings entailed upon him as the effects of the vanquished disease. And only after he has surmounted and exhausted them all, does he

reach the goal of restored health and strength. Verily is he made perfect through suffering.

Thus did the Saviour pass through all the painful effects and penalties entailed upon humanity by sin. And only after He had drunk the cup to its bitterest dregs, and endured and exhausted its last and highest penalty, did He reach the goal of perfection. Then from the eminence of His victory over death and the grave, did He proclaim His kingdom in these tremendous words, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, go ye therefore and disciple all nations."

It requires no labored thought from this point of view, to see that the completion of our nature as effected in the person of Christ, cannot be wrought out upon the plane of our natural Adamic life. In this estate man is dead to the higher divine life. And only as this life reaches down from above and enters into and apprehends our natural life, can it be raised to its union with God. "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." (St. John 3: 13.) The natural man has no power to go out of himself and apprehend and appropriate the divine to his spiritual completion. The power of faith, the power to discern the supernatural, is latent as a faculty of the human soul. Its function is that of receptivity rather than that of positive apprehension. In other words, faith is the organ, the spiritual sense, the avenue through which the divine brought to it from above by the Holy Spirit, enters into the soul and takes up its abode. This susceptibility weakened, enfeebled and restrained as a mere potentiality by sin, is quickened and energized by the preached gospel. "Faith cometh by hearing." With faith thus energized into receptive activity, the soul is in the necessary attitude for the reception of the divine-human life of Christ, which by the regenerative energy of the Holy Ghost, is brought to and through this receptive avenue, enters into the will. It takes up its abode, not as a germ to develop its latent potentialities, but like leaven, which through the native affinities and aptitudes of man's spiritual

nature, enters into and permeates the whole life. This inflow in the process of sanctification is conditioned by the growth and development of faith, the enlargement of man's receptive capacities. Hence the necessity on one hand of the continued ministry of the preached word, to increase the growth in faith, and on the other, the no less continued ministry of the body and blood of Christ, as the sacramental means for the continuous inflow of the divine-human life. The soul, by this we mean man's whole inner life, in the article of the new creation or regeneration, is passive. The divine enters through the avenue of quickened faith, and once lodged within, the will, not faith, through the functions of its native affinities and aptitudes co-operates with the leavening power of the divine life, to the progressive movement of sanctification. Just as truth entering the reason through the avenues of the senses, is apprehended by the will, which through the functions of the rational powers, facilitates its apprehension and appropriation in the form of conscious knowledge. Thus does the believer on the one hand grow in faith, and on the other, in grace and the conscious knowledge of everlasting life.

Thus is it that we are complete in Jesus Christ, who is the head of all principality and power, and in whom also "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." He is the fountain of life, and only as we are mystically and vitally united with Him, can we have life; and only as we are enabled by spiritual illumination to rationally discern the contents of His person, can we attain to true wisdom and knowledge—a true and ultimately infallible theology.

III.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.*

BY REV. W. RUPP, D.D.

THE idea of inspiration, in the general signification of a divine influence upon human knowledge, is not peculiar to Christianity. Other religions make the same claim for their sacred books which Christianity makes for the Bible. The Vedas, among the Hindus, and the Zendavesta, among the Persians, were believed to have had their origin in some supernatural influence upon the minds of their authors, and to possess the quality of inspiration. Among the Greeks and Romans, all striking, or peculiar mental phenomena, were referred to the immediate influence of some divinity. The poet, the orator, the philosopher, as well as the man of action, were believed to be filled with the spirit of some god. "Men do not produce beautiful poems," says Plato, "by rules of art (τέχνη), but by being full of deity, (ἐνθεοὶ ὄντες) and possessed." Cicero, in the oration for Archias, states that it was the opinion of the greatest and most learned men that "the poet derives his power from nature, and is filled by the breath of a divine spirit;" and elsewhere he observes that "no man was ever great without some divine afflatus."

The same general idea prevailed also among the Jews, as well as among other Semitic nations. By these the wisdom of the lawgiver, the skill of the architect, the eloquence of the

* This paper was read, substantially as here published, with the exception of the notes, at the Conference of Reformed ministers of Western Pennsylvania, at Butler, Pa., the last week of August, 1891. It is published in this REVIEW at the request of the Conference.

poet, as well as the prescience of the prophet, were all regarded as the direct gift of Jehovah. Bezaleel and Hiram, Joshua and Solomon, as well as Moses and Isaiah, were believed to have been filled with wisdom, and prepared for their particular callings by the Spirit of God. Indeed, all knowledge was supposed to have its origin in some divine impression or influence upon the human mind, while the mind itself was regarded as a special divine gift. "There is a spirit in man," it was said, "and the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

This general quality of inspiration was, of course, ascribed to the writers of the sacred books, at the time when those books were written; but there is no evidence that anything more than this was ascribed to them. There is no trace in the Old Testament that the writers thereof either believed themselves, or were believed by their contemporaries, to be inspired in any other sense than that in which all good and pious men were believed to be inspired. When David said, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was upon my tongue," he claimed no more than might have been claimed for any other great and good Israelite whose words were never committed to writing.

In post-canonical Judaism the idea of the inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament was much intensified, and their compositions came to be regarded as *sacred Scriptures*, an expression that occurs for the first time in 1 Mac. xii. 9. But even then no specific difference was generally made between the inspiration of those writers and that which was supposed to be at least possible in the case of common believers. Philo, whose thinking was influenced largely by Greek ideas, did more than any other writer to formulate the doctrine of inspiration which the Christian Church afterwards received from the Synagogue. He appropriated the Greek conception of a divine phrenzy (*μανία*) and used it as an explanation of the psychological condition of an inspired person, and held that the divine light rises in a man in proportion as that of his own consciousness goes down. And yet, that even he did not assume any

specific difference between the inspiration of the writers of Sacred Scripture and that of other highly endowed persons, is plain from the fact that he does not hesitate at times to claim inspiration even for himself. Philo, moreover, while maintaining that every word in Scripture is inspired, yet admitted that there are degrees of inspiration, and that all the books of Scripture are not alike in this respect. Josephus, also, while greatly magnifying the Jewish Scriptures as certain sources of divine information, yet makes a distinction between the writings of the prophets who have given "the original and earliest accounts of things as they learned them from God Himself by inspiration," and the books of other sacred writers, who have, in a distinct manner, related what happened in their own times.

The writers of the New Testament, in the same manner as Philo and Josephus, treat the Old Testament with the highest veneration as Sacred Scripture, pervaded by the breath of the Divine Spirit, and therefore profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness. While, however, they had these exalted ideas of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, there is no direct evidence that they regarded their own writings in the same sacred character. Though the Church afterwards, under the guidance of an unerring divine instinct, placed these writings in the same class with those of the Old Testament, their authors themselves, so far as any direct evidence appears, had no such anticipation. They did not regard themselves as especially commissioned and qualified to give to the church an infallible code of doctrines and precepts, that should serve as an inviolable measure of faith and practice for all time. Their writing was something incidental only to their office of evangelists and preachers of the Gospel to their own contemporaries. Its motive and purpose were determined by the existing circumstances of the time. When they wrote the apostles did not claim to be in any special sense instruments of the Holy Spirit for communicating to the world new truths with an authority entirely different from that which belonged to their ordinary teaching. Though they believed themselves

to be inspired, that is, filled with the Spirit of Christ, both when they wrote and when they spoke, they did not claim this inspiration to be a special source of knowledge, or a condition of infallibility in respect of their writings.

The writers of the New Testament sometimes claim that they have received certain truths by special acts of divine revelation ; as St. Paul, for example, declares that he received from the Lord the account of the institution of the eucharist ; and, indeed, they assume that the whole body of truth which they have to communicate, rests ultimately upon the self-revelation of God in Christ through the Spirit. The Gospel is not an invention ; it has not been reasoned out of innate ideas, or out of premises naturally inherent in the human mind ; it is a revelation. But the writers of the New Testament never identify this revelation with inspiration. And they never claim to have come into possession of the facts of revelation in any other than the common psychological way, which, however, must not be restricted to the operation of the five senses ; nor do they claim that, in committing these facts to writing, they are governed by any other than the ordinary psychological laws, or guided by any other than the ordinary rules of literary composition.

St. Luke says distinctly that in gathering the material for his Gospel, he followed the common historical method of examining eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the facts which he was about to record. These facts were not made known to him supernaturally. Similarly St. John tells us that he has obtained the knowledge of the things which he is going to write about in the ordinary psychological manner. "That which we have seen with our eyes," he says, "that which we beheld, and our hands handled concerning the word of life . . . that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." There is no intimation here, or anywhere else in the New Testament, that the apostles, when writing their books, were communicating facts or truths that were put into their minds in contravention of those common psychological laws which govern the acquisition of all knowledge. Even when they received supernatural im-

pressions or communications in a state of trance or vision, like the author of the Apocalypse, or St. Paul, when caught up into Paradise, they were afterwards obliged to reproduce and elaborate these impressions in their ordinary consciousness, and by means of their ordinary mental faculties, before they were able to commit them to writing; a thing which St. Paul, at least in the case referred to, was unable to do, so that he was obliged to be content with simply saying that he heard unspeakable things which it is impossible (ἐξόν) for a man to utter.

The inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture, then, did not consist in any communication to them of knowledge in a miraculous way, nor in any miraculous direction of them during the work of literary composition. As a preliminary positive definition, we here lay down the proposition, that the inspiration of the sacred writers consisted in such a spiritual quickening of their souls, through immediate contact with the Spirit of truth in consciousness, as to enable them to form true and adequate conceptions of the things revealed, and therefore also to communicate the same to others in a true and adequate form; this influence of the Spirit being exercised, not in contravention of the general psychological laws which govern all mental operations, but in entire conformity therewith; and being dependent always upon the historical revelation of God in Christ. The Spirit speaks not of Himself, but He takes of the things of Christ and shows them to the disciples; and it is only in this way that He leads them into all truth. And the quality which belongs to the knowledge of the original recipients of the revelation in virtue of this influence of the Spirit of revelation upon their souls, belongs also to the Bible, which becomes thus the original, true, and sufficient record of revelation.

We have, then, these three conceptions to deal with in the further discussion of our subject, namely, *revelation*, the *Bible*, and *inspiration*. In this discussion, however, we can do but little more, within the limits of this paper, than simply present propositions without argument, relying upon the logical consis-

tency of statement and upon the reasonableness and self-consistency of the theory as a whole for its convincing force.

Revelation is the objective self-manifestation of God in human life and history; the Bible is the original record of that revelation; and inspiration is that quality of the Bible which makes it to be a *true, living, and sufficient* record of the divine revelation.

There is a three-fold manifestation of God, namely, a manifestation in *nature*, in *human consciousness*, and in *history*. The outward world of nature contains a manifestation of God, which discloses especially His power, His wisdom, and His goodness. The best interpreter of this manifestation is the *poet*. The inward nature of man also contains a manifestation of God. The necessary laws of reason and conscience give us the ideas of absolute existence and of absolute goodness. To interpret this inward manifestation of God is the task of the *philosopher*. But these ideas of absolute existence and of absolute goodness would be mere empty conceptions, or forms of thought, if God did not also manifest Himself directly in human consciousness and experience. As by means of our sensuous nature we have direct intuitions of the outer world, so through our spiritual nature we have direct intuitions of God and of Divine things; and these intuitions give to our rational conceptions of God their contents, and impart to the so-called religions of nature their spiritual force and vitality, making them to be something more than mere systems of empty idolatry. To interpret this manifestation of God in consciousness is the special calling of the *theosophist* or *mystic*.

But God reveals Himself especially in history, which, of course, does not exclude but include all the other forms of divine self-manifestation; and this is the revelation with which we are now particularly concerned. The organ of this revelation is the *prophet*, in the most general sense of the word as denoting *one who speaks for God*. The other forms of divine revelation are incidentally recognized in the Bible, but of this the Bible is the express and formal record.

The historical self-manifestation of God in human life, as it is portrayed in Sacred Scripture, forms an organic process, which, while starting at the very commencement of human development and embracing the whole race of man in its ultimate scope, had its main current, for ages, in the life and history of a single people, and there concentrated itself at last, and came to its absolute completion, in the person and life of a single individual, who is Himself God manifest in the flesh—the life and light of the world. In the history of Israel God manifested Himself from time to time by means of outward occurrences and inward impressions, which served to disclose His nature, His mind and character, and His purposes in regard to man, so far as men were then capable of receiving such disclosure. The special organs and interpreters of this revelation were the prophets. “God spake, in times past, unto the fathers in the prophets.” It was in this way that Israel, which started at first from the common level of Semitic heathenism, came at last to have conceptions of God which, in respect both of intellectual and ethical purity, so far surpassed those of its neighbors.

The fact should be emphasized here and steadily borne in mind, that the special content of divine revelation is *God Himself*. What God reveals is Himself, His nature, His mind, His character, His thoughts and purposes. The object of divine revelation is not to make known things pertaining to history or science, which man is capable of finding out by the exercise of his own faculties. When physical and historical conceptions are intertwined with divine facts in the record of revelation; as is the case, for example, in the accounts of the creation, of the flood, of the dispersion of mankind, and of the ancient Oriental empires—these conceptions belong not to the *essence*, but merely to the *setting* of the revelation. The same is true of philosophical and psychological conceptions; so that a Biblical psychology, for example, must be as much of a mistake as a Biblical geology or physiology would be. The purely historical, scientific, or philosophical conceptions that are met with in the Bible, are simply

the conceptions that were generally current in the time of its authors, and can therefore not lay claim to the authority of divine revelation. The essence of divine revelation, for the preservation and communication of which the Bible exists, is the nature, the mind, and the character of God. Everything else in the record is incidental or inferential.

And this self-revelation of God, which as a connected series of divine operations runs through the whole history of Israel, came to its culmination at last in the Christ, in whom the entire divine mind, the Divine Logos or Reason itself, is visibly expressed in human nature and life. "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, a glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Christ Himself says to His disciples: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father . . . I am in the Father, and the Father in me. The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth His works." God who formerly spake unto the fathers in the prophets, by divers portions and in divers manners, has now spoken once for all in His Son, in whom He has uttered the whole plenitude of His being. In the person, the life, the words and works of Christ, in His suffering and death, in His resurrection and glorification, and in His mediatorial reign and activity in the Church by the Spirit, there is an absolute disclosure of the nature, the mind, and the character of God. And this objective disclosure of the being and mind of God, together with the subjective impression produced by this disclosure through mediation of the Spirit in the minds of men, is what we call *divine revelation*.

The idea of revelation implies that the divine fact or truth disclosed be adequately apprehended and understood. A revelation that should contradict the laws of human reason, or that should essentially transcend its capacity, would be no revelation at all. The idea of revelation further implies that by the apprehension of it a subjective mental or emotional state be produced in the soul corresponding to the character of the objective divine truth; in like manner, for example, that a beau-

tiful object or scene in nature, when properly apprehended, awakens peculiar emotions and puts the mind into a peculiar æsthetic mood. Now, according to the teaching of the New Testament, the medium through which the divine revelation makes its peculiar impression upon the soul, and through which its full force and meaning are borne in upon the percipient mind, is the Holy Spirit, who, acting as the Spirit of Christ, takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. As the poet in his communion with nature is in contact, not merely with dead or inert forms of matter, but with the living mind that is in nature, and that so stirs and quickens his imagination as to enable him to gain a *real* and not merely *notional* apprehension of its truth; so the human organ of divine revelation is in contact, not merely with the outward form of a divine deed or word, but with the divine mind or Spirit itself, which so impresses the human spirit as to produce a *real* and *vital* apprehension of the truth to be communicated. And the peculiar mental condition, the emotional movement or thrill, produced by this spiritual impression, is the *state of inspiration*, which is thus a necessary subjective complement of the objective divine operation in the process of revelation.

And, now, of this process of revelation and of its ultimate result in the establishment of the kingdom of God the Bible is the original and permanent record in human language. When we say in *human language*, the expression, though seemingly trite, implies that the Bible is really a human book, and that in its composition and structure it really conforms to the laws of human thought and speech. It is the essential part of the literature of the people of revelation, providentially originated and preserved, no doubt, yet partaking of the common characteristics of all national literatures. And yet the Bible is also a peculiar book, differing from other books as much as its substantial contents differ from those of other books. This peculiarity may be said to consist in the breath of the Divine Spirit—the Spirit of revelation—breathing from its contents upon the spirit of the devout reader, and bringing the latter into immedi-

ate contact with the substance of the divine revelation. And this peculiarity we denote by the term *inspiration*.

It is often said that the Bible *was given by inspiration*, meaning that its contents were directly communicated, by the Holy Spirit, to the minds of the sacred writers, either in the form of words, or in the form of bare ideas to be clothed in words by the writers themselves; somewhat after the manner in which a teacher may dictate sentences to a pupil. This expression, though countenanced by the translation, in the Common Version, of 2 Tim. 3: 16, is nevertheless erroneous and misleading. Instead of saying that the Bible was given by inspiration, we should rather say that, having been written by inspired men, *it is itself inspired*, the inspiration inhering in it as an essential and permanent quality. The predicate *θεόπνευστος*, which the apostle applies to the whole Scripture, does not relate merely to the manner in which this Scripture originated, but asserts the fact that it is fragrant always with the breath of God which is in it, and which makes it to be profitable for edification in all the various conditions of the religious life.*

The inspiration of the writers of Sacred Scripture, in the view here presented, consisted in a peculiar quickening and exaltation of mind produced by immediate contact with the Spirit of truth; and this quality or state of mind, communicated to the Bible, imparts to it a form or character which makes it to be an appropriate medium for direct communication with the same Spirit on the part of the reader. As an inspired book the Bible thus serves the purpose of putting the sympathetic reader virtually into the same relation to the objective divine

* Grammatically we regard *θεόπνευστος*, in the passage referred to above, as a *predicate*, co-ordinate with *ὠφέλιμος*. To treat it as an *attributive* directly connected with the subject *γραφή*, and to insert a copula between it and *καὶ*, we hold, would be grammatical violence. We believe that the proper word to be supplied is the participle *ὄνσα*, which should be inserted after *γραφή*. Then the sentence will read: "All Scripture being divinely inspired, and profitable for teaching," &c. For similar constructions see 1 Tim. 1: 15; 2: 3; 4: 9, and Tit. 3: 8, 9. Of course the Scripture referred to in this passage is that of the Old Testament.

truth, or revelation, in which the writers themselves stood, and of enabling him to form the same religious ideas and sentiments which filled the souls of those writers while they were engaged in the work of composition. The inspiration of the Bible, accordingly, does not make it a dead code of doctrines and precepts for the legal regulation of faith and practice by the Church, but a book of lively oracles for the quickening of religious life in the soul of the reader. And this is its immediate and primary object, while its relation to doctrine is but mediate and secondary.*

The inspiration of the Bible is thus akin to what may be called artistic genius, or genial inspiration in the sphere of art. This comparison is suggested by the fact that the ancients, both Greeks and Hebrews, applied the same word to mental phenomena of an artistic as well as of a religious character, and will serve to make plain our meaning. A work of art is an embodiment of a certain ideal that has sprung up in the soul of the artist in consequence of certain influences exerted by his environment. And in proportion that it is a true work of art, possessing the real fire of genial inspiration, it will awaken in the mind of the sympathetic beholder the same idea that thrilled

* As an infallible *statutory* revelation of truths to be believed, and precepts to be observed, the Bible would have to be pronounced a complete failure. For such a revelation ought to leave no room for uncertainty or doubt in regard to anything. It ought to speak in such way as to cut off all occasion for difference of opinion, among good men, at least. But the Bible does not so speak. There is scarcely a question in theology in regard to which the Bible has not been made to teach opposite views. Surely, if God meant to give us an infallible code by the outward application of which all questions are to be settled, as questions are settled in courts of law by appeals to the statutes, then He has made a mistake in giving us the Bible such as it is. For this may be quoted by equally honest and good men on opposite sides of the same question; as we know, for example, that it is quoted in favor of infant baptism and against infant baptism, in favor of predestination and against predestination, in favor of episcopacy and against episcopacy, in favor of the divinity of Christ and against the divinity of Christ—and so on of other dogmas too numerous to mention. What good is there in having an infallible code whose interpretation is so uncertain? Does not this difference of interpretation prove that this conception of the Bible and this use of it must be radically wrong?

the soul of the artist when he was engaged in the production of it. A true poem must be capable of awakening, in the soul of the poetic reader at least, the same poetic fire that burned in the soul of the poet while he was pouring forth his verses. Now it is the peculiarity of Scripture that it enables the sympathetic religious reader to conceive the same religious ideas and sentiments that swelled the souls of the writers at the time when they were writing. There is in the language of the Bible a certain spiritual glow—a warm breath, that is felt at times even by the dullest reader. In order to feel this peculiarity one need only to read certain chapters in the Old Testament, and then read the same accounts in the pages of Josephus. The latter contains an abundance of dry rhetoric and vapid declamation, which, however, excites no admiration and kindles no fire in the soul of the reader; while the former, without any art, and with marvellous simplicity of style, breathes from its pages the very breath of the Spirit of truth, and causes the facts of revelation to touch the reader's mind in a way that carries a spiritually vitalizing influence to his heart. And this peculiarity is what we call *the inspiration of Scripture*.

Precisely in what this peculiarity consists it may be difficult to define; as it is difficult also to define that which distinguishes a true work of art from the mere prosaic product of a mechanical operation—a true poem for example, from a set of verses made by the aid of a rhyming dictionary. One can better feel the difference than define it. In the case of a work of art there must be a living ideal and an adequate expression of that ideal. For the apprehension of the ideal by the observer the form in which it is expressed is all important. The ideal must look through the form, as the human soul looks through the body. A real poem consists of high thought expressed in corresponding language. It is the mutual adaptation of high thought and high language that constitutes the inspiration of the poem, that is, the power of exciting high thought in the mind of the reader; although the proper soul of the poem consists in the thought, not in the words; and it is the soul that creates the form, not

the form the soul.* So, in like manner, it is the living divine thought, born of direct contact with the Spirit of revelation, and expressed in a form and style of language perfectly adapted to the divine thought, that constitutes the inspiration of the Bible. That which constitutes, for our apprehension at least, a most essential element in the quality of inspiration, is precisely this peculiarity of form and style, in virtue of which we are enabled to communicate directly and effectively with the soul or substance of truth within.

Still the soul or thought, here also, is the original or primary element that created the form or language; not the reverse. And the same soul, because it is alive and not dead, is capable of creating more than one form. It does not perish when separated from the particular linguistic form in which it was first clothed. The inspiration of the Bible is not so bound to the grammatical, rhetorical and other peculiarities of the languages in which it first appeared, that it is therefore incapable of being expressed in other languages. On the contrary, the living thought of the Bible may utter itself in diverse tongues, without losing any essential part of its original vitality and fervor. This adaptability of the living thought of the Bible to the forms of different languages is greatly facilitated by the structural simplicity of the tongues in which the Bible was first written, namely, the Hebrew and Hellenistic Greek; the latter, as used in the New Testament, being largely influenced in its grammatical structure by the simple genius of the former. Many a scholarly reader of the New Testament has doubtless wished at times that the Apostles had written in classic Greek. But while, in that case, their writings might have had somewhat more of logical precision, and might perhaps have contained

* We are reminded here of the question, long debated, whether the true poetic feeling may be possessed by any one without the power of poetic expression. Wordsworth held that one may possess the "vision and the faculty divine," and yet want the "accomplishment of verse." Goethe was of the opposite opinion. However this may be, it is certain that no one can communicate his poetic feeling to another, unless he possesses the faculty of poetic expression.

fewer *cruces interpretum*, yet we may be sure that they would have lacked much of their present power of addressing us in our own tongues without any loss of their original force. No translation of Homer or Plato into a modern tongue can entirely reproduce the Greek genius, while scarcely any Christian translation of the New Testament can lack the Christian fire and spirit of the original. Much of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, is in the form of poetry; but it is such poetry as admits, by the very laws of its structure, of easy reproduction in other languages. It must be added, however, that, as it is only a poet that can translate a poet, or a philosopher that can interpret a philosopher, so it is only a Christian scholar who has himself caught something of the original inspiration of the Bible, that can translate the Bible. It follows, accordingly, that any translation that has caught anything of the original fire of the Bible, though it may lack verbal exactness, and even, like the Septuagint, contain many errors, will still not be without the quality of inspiration, and will be capable of accomplishing the purpose for which the Bible exists. Any doubt that may exist in regard to this point, is put to silence by the extensive use which the writers of the New Testament make of the Septuagint, with all its imperfections, and with its material departures from the Hebrew text.

But while thus the inspiration of the Bible is not rigidly confined to its original text and its original tongues, it still remains true that one of the essential elements of inspiration consists in that peculiarity of form and style, which makes the language of the Bible an appropriate vehicle for the indwelling divine Spirit. We can, therefore in a certain sense, appropriate to our view the term *verbal inspiration*. This term is not popular now. Many who still cling to the idea of a supernatural or miraculous communication of knowledge in inspiration, nevertheless reject the doctrine of *verbal* inspiration which became current after the Reformation, namely, the doctrine that the Holy Spirit dictated, either into the pens or minds of the sacred writers, the very words which they were to commit

to writing, so that, in the original manuscripts at least, every syllable and dot rested upon immediate divine authority.* This view is now generally rejected; but those who still adhere to the substance of the old doctrine, maintain that the Spirit communicated to the writers the ideas or thoughts that were to be expressed, but for the expression of which the writers were left to themselves to find the adequate words. In this way there is explained the diversity of style in the various books of the Bible. Each writer of the Bible wrote in the language and style peculiar to his individuality as well as to his age and nation; but the thought or "concept" was given to him by the Holy Spirit.

But this view presupposes a separation between thought and speech that does not exist in reality. In reality thought and word form but one existence; and no thought is possible without language. For this reason a favorite formula in the Bible for expressing the idea that one thinks, is that "he speaks in his heart." Even if there be no external utterance of words, the occurrence of thought implies that there is at least an inward shaping of words in the mind. There could, therefore, be no communication of thought, as thought, without a communication of words. It is only by means of words that we can communicate our thoughts to others; or rather, cause others to think the same thoughts that are in our minds; for in strictness of signification, thought as such cannot be communicated from one person to another at all. Thought is not an entity separable from mind, and capable of being handed about from one person to another,

*The *Formula Consensus Helvetici*, of the year 1675, maintains that the Old Testament is inspired "tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltem potestatum, et tum quoad res, tum quoad verba." And by inspiration there is meant here *impartation* of the subject matter of the sacred books. Calovius, a Lutheran theologian of the seventeenth century, whose daily prayer was the charitable petition, "Imple me, Domine, odio hereticorum," says: "It is impious and profane audacity to change a single point in the Word of God, and to substitute a smooth breathing for a rough one, or a rough for a smooth one." He either forgot, or did not know, that the original manuscripts of the Bible had neither breathings, accents, nor punctuation marks.

like a material object. Thought is a state or form of mind itself; and each one must, therefore, form his own thought, either by occasion of words addressed to him as signs of thought, or by occasion of impressions made upon his organs of sense, either external or internal. The fact remains, then, that thought can be communicated only by means of words, which the human mind, in its collective capacity, has produced as expressive signs of its own inward states. And it appears, accordingly, that the theory of *verbal inspiration* is the only form in which the notion of a miraculous or extra-psychological communication of knowledge can lay any claim at all to the attribute of rationality.* But we believe that this whole notion is untenable and must be rejected. The revelation took place, not in the form of words or finished thoughts proclaimed from the sky, but in the form of objective facts and impressions. The knowledge of these facts and the meaning of these impressions were acquired by the writers of Scripture in a manner conformable to the ordinary psychological laws; but the peculiar *mental tone* or *mood* produced by this knowledge, imparted to their written compositions a peculiar form or style adapted to produce the same mental tone in the soul of the reader.† In so far, then, as the efficiency of the Bible for the purpose for which it exists, de-

* We hold to the idea of the possibility of direct psychical impressions by the Divine Spirit, but such impressions are not thoughts. They can be translated into thoughts only by the mind's own intellectual activity, and in this operation there always exists the possibility of error. The correct interpretation of these direct spiritual impressions results only from a long educational process through which humanity is passing under the guiding hand of God. They belong, however, to the method of God's self-manifestation to the human spirit. But this is revelation, not inspiration.

† Or shall we say that the effect produced by the devout reading of the Bible is due simply to a direct influence of the Holy Spirit accompanying such reading? In this case there would be no *formal difference* at all between the Bible and other religious books; for such influence of the Holy Spirit may be exercised in connection with the reading of any such books, and is believed to be exercised especially in connection with the hearing of sermons. It has, however, always been the belief of the Christian world that the Bible differs *formally* from all other religious books; and that difference we believe to be due to its *inspiration*, in the sense explained above.

pend upon the perfect adaptation of its words to its thoughts, in so far we can allow a certain right to the theory of *verbal inspiration*.

We can also, in a certain sense, appropriate the term *plenary inspiration*, namely, in the sense that the *whole* Bible is inspired, and that this inspiration makes it *fully adequate* for the purpose for which it is intended. The whole Bible is inspired, because there is in the whole of it the breath of the Spirit of revelation, that wrought in the history of the chosen people from Abraham to St. John, and that still works in the history of Christianity. The whole Bible is inspired, because it all testifies of Christ. But this does not mean that every part of the Bible is *equally* inspired, and therefore of equal value for the development of Christian life and thought. Origen says that "Jesus and Paul were alike full of the Holy Spirit, but the capacity of Paul was much less than that of Jesus, though each was filled according to his measure." And, to use an illustration of Richard Baxter's, we may say that, as the soul is in a man's whole body, and yet is not in the hairs of the head and in the nails of the fingers and toes in the same way and measure that it is in the heart and in the brain, so the spirit of revelation is in the whole Bible, and yet it is not in the same way and measure in all the books of the Bible, nor even in all the parts of the same book. Chronicles, and Esther, and Proverbs, and the Song of Solomon are not inspired in the same measure as the Gospel of St. John; nor are Paul's statements concerning marriage and celibacy inspired in the same measure as his grand psalm on charity in the letter to the Corinthians. Nor are all Biblical writings of equal value to the Church. There are portions of the Bible that are comparatively of little importance, and that could be lost without impairing the integrity of revelation; as, in fact, some apostolic as well as prophetic writings have doubtless been lost.*

* St. Paul wrote at least two epistles that have not been preserved in the canon of the New Testament, namely, one to the Corinthians, referred to 1 Cor. 5: 9, and one to the Laodiceans, referred to Col. 4: 16. Are we to suppose that these were not inspired? Surely not. And yet their loss has not been fatal to Christianity.

These unessential portions of Scripture serve only as a *setting* to the essential facts of revelation. Their value is not in themselves, but in the gems which they enclose.

Then, again, the inspiration of the Bible is plenary in the sense that it is *complete*, rendering the Bible fully adequate to the purpose for which it exists. This purpose is to serve as a medium for the full knowledge of revelation, and thus as a condition for the full development of the religious life. All that is necessary for man to know in order to live the highest moral and religious life is contained in the Bible, in a form that carries the evidence of its truthfulness on its face. In other words, the Bible enables us to know enough of God, of His nature and character, of His thought and will, and of His counsels and purposes, to fulfill to the utmost the design of our existence. When, however, the Bible is regarded as a storehouse of all manner of infallible information on all manner of subjects, theological, psychological, ethical, physical, historical, chronological, geological, astronomical, and so forth, then it is disappointing, for it is not designed for such a universal purpose. Its writers were not omniscient. Their inspiration did not make them infallible, or exempt them from any possibility of error. They claim for themselves no such attribute. They do not, as we have already seen, claim the quality of inspiration in any sense specifically different from that in which it belongs to all other saints. Though holy men, who speak as they are moved by the Holy Spirit, they are nevertheless but men; and their speech must necessarily be subject to the same limitations which belong to all human speech.

In one respect, indeed, the inspiration of the writers of Scripture differed from that of later Christians of eminent spiritual endowments, namely, in respect of the fact that they were *original witnesses* of the revelation, which, of course, no later Christians could be. And so the Bible differs from all other religious books, even of the highest value, by reason of the fact that it is the *original record* of revelation. This, of course, is a difference of very serious import. The position of the writers

of Scripture in the religious history of the world was unique; and so also their subjective endowments must have been unique. There have never been any other such men, either before or since, as the authors of Scripture, possessing just such mental and spiritual endowments as they possessed. Their talents were singular, even as their position and calling were singular. A man is what he is only as the product of his time and of his environment; and it is, therefore, only in the midst of his environment that he can be and do what, by Divine Providence, he is intended to be and to do. Homer was possible only in Greece during the eighth century before Christ; and Shakespeare was possible only in the England of the time of Elizabeth. And so the Apostles were possible only in the time of Christ, and under Syrian skies. And in order to have a full conception of the meaning of their inspiration, we must take into consideration both their unique position in the world's spiritual history and their peculiar mental endowments and spiritual characteristics. Their inspiration was a peculiar mental condition, determined both by their original mental and moral constitution and by the peculiar combination of spiritual circumstances in the midst of which they found themselves placed, and which can never recur again in the history of the world. Prophets and apostles, like poets, are not made, but born. They are born with those mental and spiritual gifts which, under the influence of their subsequent environment, develop into the condition of inspiration; and gift and environment are pre-adapted to each other in the divine plan and government of the world. "Spirits are not finely touched, but to fine issues." God's prophets are not only endowed with keenness of spiritual perception, but they stand near also to the central current of the world's advancing life, every pulse-beat of which affects their sensibility. It is this that makes them in some measure seers of future events. They are able to see far into the future, because they see deep into the present. They have a profound apprehension of God's character and purposes, and of the laws and principles of His government, as well as of the moral constitution of the world, and

of the relations and consequences of finite actions, and are able, therefore, to discern events in their beginnings, and to predict things that are future. It is in this sense that Jehovah does nothing without revealing His secret unto His servants the prophets.

In respect of their unique endowment, and in respect of the singularity of their position in the world's religious history, then, the inspiration of the writers of Scripture was something peculiar to themselves. No reformer, preacher or theologian could, therefore, ever be inspired just in the same way in which the prophets and apostles were inspired; not because his subjective spiritual condition might not be the same, but because his relation to the objective course of revelation could not be the same. In respect of its essential nature, however, the inspiration of the writers of Sacred Scripture was not specifically different from that of other Christians. It did not contravene the laws of their mental faculties, or abrogate the normal use of their reason; and while it made them *competent* and *sufficient* witnesses of revelation, it did not make them infallible in all their utterances and in all their writings.

The quality of absolute infallibility is one that is not needed at all in order to make the Bible a sufficient record of divine revelation; and the claim of this quality is one that cannot be sustained by the actual facts of the Bible as they lie before us.* There is in the Bible the infallible divine truth—for all truth as such is infallible—that is required in order to make men wise

* The question concerning the infallibility or inerrancy of the Bible is one that cannot be decided on dogmatic grounds. Infallibility is not a corollary of inspiration. The question can be decided only by a critical study of the Bible itself; and such study does not lead to an affirmative conclusion. There are especially historical, geographical and scientific statements contained in the Bible that do not square with facts as they are now understood. The usual methods of removing these inaccuracies by arbitrary assumptions, as, for example, of interpolations, or corruptions of the original text, and similar shifts, are something very much like the sin of "handling the word of God deceitfully," which God can certainly not approve. The word of God does not need the service of deception or falsehood; nor can its acceptance be promoted by such service.

unto salvation. But there are in the Bible also innumerable things that have nothing to do with salvation, and in connection with which the human character of the book appears most manifestly. What, for example, has the size of Og's bedstead, or the number of men that fell in a particular battle, or perished in a pestilence, to do with our salvation? But it may be objected that, if we admit this distinction between infallible religious truth and fallible human additions in the Bible—or between the word of God in the Bible and things which are not the word of God—then we have no criterion by which to distinguish the one from the other. To this we would reply that there is, indeed, no criterion or rule by the mechanical application of which we could distinguish between the divine and the human, but that the Christian consciousness is nevertheless a practical criterion that is sufficient for this purpose; just as the cultivated taste of the artist is sufficient to discriminate between a true work of art and its opposite. The application of this criterion, however, must be made in a *moral* way, agreeably to the declaration of Christ: "If any one will do the doctrine, he shall know whether it be of God;" and the result will be moral certainty instead of mechanical infallibility.*

Those who insist on the absolute infallibility or total inerrancy of the Bible as a necessary consequence of its inspiration usu-

* The Holy Spirit has not only given the Church the Bible, but also Himself dwells permanently in the Church to guide her into all truth. On grounds of reason it is as easy to believe that the Holy Spirit renders the Church infallible as it is to believe that He has given to the Church an infallible Bible. Of course such a belief could not be sustained by the hard facts of Church history. Nor is such a belief necessary in order to the conviction that the Spirit, ever present in the Church, will always guide the mind of the Church to what is substantially the right apprehension of the truth contained in the Bible. If the Bible is divine, so also is the Church. And we suppose there are few Protestants now who would hold that "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." Without at all going over to Roman Catholicism, we hold that the Church also is an important factor in our religion. And the Christian consciousness of the Church, born of the interaction of innumerable Christian minds under the guiding influence of the Holy Spirit, may be trusted to discriminate, with sufficient accuracy for all practical purposes, between the human and the divine elements in Scripture.

ally claim this quality only for the original autographs of the sacred writers. No translation, it is said, and no copy of the original text, can be infallible; for translations and copies being human productions, they must necessarily share the quality of imperfection with all human things. Indeed, the conception of inspiration itself is by some thus restricted. "The claim for inspiration in behalf of the Scripture records," says Prof. W. P. Beecher, in the American Supplement of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," article *Inspiration*, "is limited to the autograph writings and to faithful copies of the same. Though the original Scripture record was perfect, imperfections may creep into the copies." The consequence of this limitation, then, would be that the great majority of Christians, who are not able to read Greek and Hebrew, and even the majority of preachers, who can do no more than spell out sentences by the constant use of grammar and lexicon, have, after all, no infallible Bible, yea, not even an inspired Bible.

But more than this. The original autographs of the several writer have all been lost beyond the possibility of recovery. But the variety of readings which are found in existing manuscripts shows that we do not now possess the original text in its absolute perfection. There are no copies so faithful as to contain no variations from the original. In all existing manuscripts, both of the Old Testament and of the New, there are interpolations, omissions, and emendations which differentiate these manuscripts from the original autographs. The existing Hebrew text probably varies more from the original than does the Greek, although the number of different readings is much smaller, the variant manuscripts having most likely been arbitrarily suppressed by the rulers of the Synagogue. Critical scholarship is, indeed, engaged in correcting the manuscripts, and in restoring as far as possible the original text. But criticism being itself fallible, like any other human science, its results must be fallible likewise; and it cannot, therefore, succeed in giving us an infallible Bible. The infallible Bible, like the poet's golden age, is thus a thing entirely of the past. It can never again

become a present reality. But of what use is it for us to know that the Bible was infallible once, namely, so long as the original autographs were in existence, if we cannot be sure that we now possess it in the same infallible form? Should it be said that any errors which may be shown to be in the Bible, whether they are original or merely the result of transcription, do not affect the substance of religious and moral truth, and that for the actual needs of the religious and moral life the Bible is practically errorless, this we readily and cheerfully admit—*indeed, this is our own position*, for which we hold that it is necessary to contend as for an important citadel of the faith; but, then, we submit that whoever takes this position gives up the idea of infallibility.*

We maintain, however, that there is nothing lost by giving up this idea. What good would an infallible Bible do us, so long as we are not ourselves infallible? An infallible Bible would by no means make our theological knowledge infallible. My knowledge of divine truth is only *my* knowledge; and though it were based upon an infallible Bible, it would be no more infallible than I myself am infallible. In order to make my knowledge infallible I would have need of an infallible teacher, to whom I would have to bow in blind submission, and whose words I would have to repeat as a parrot repeats those of his trainer. Indeed, this idea of an infallible Bible leads further to the idea of an infallible priesthood, and at last to the idea of an infallible Pope. As the great and good Tholuck remarked long ago, any one who cannot be sure of his Christian faith without an infallible Bible, cannot rest until he has made his submission to the infallible prince of the Church sitting in the chair of St. Peter.

* But if the errors which are claimed to be in the Bible are of such a trifling character, and if they do not affect the substance of religious truth, what, it may be asked, is the use of insisting on them? Our answer is that this must be done in the interest of a sound doctrine of inspiration, which is not a trifling matter, but of very great importance. The errors are trifling, but they refute a certain theory of inspiration, and compel us to resort to another more in harmony with the Bible as it is.

To claim absolute infallibility for the Bible is to regard it in the light of a collection of religious and moral truths miraculously communicated from heaven, which can only be understood, then, by the aid of an infallible teacher. This is the manner in which the Koran is believed to have been communicated to Mohammed. The conception of revelation underlying this view, is not the idea of a divine self-manifestation in human life and history, but the notion of a promulgation of doctrines and precepts directly from heaven, somewhat after the manner in which an earthly ruler makes known his will to his subjects. There is only this difference between the two cases, that, while the proclamations and edicts of earthly rulers are usually so clear that there can be no misunderstanding of their import, the edicts of heaven, as they are contained in the Bible, are so ambiguous that men, though convinced of their infallibility, may be forever bandying about their meaning. This conception of revelation as being the proclamation of an infallible code, was the conception of the scholastic theology of the middle ages. Christianity was then usually defined as a "new law" (*nova lex*), miraculously sent down from heaven, deposited in the Bible, entrusted to the Church, and requiring the services of an infallible lawyer always to make it available for the purpose for which it was given.

The Reformers, it is well known, along with other doctrines of the Papacy, rejected also this papal view of the Bible. They, indeed, made the Bible, as the original record of divine revelation, to be the ultimate rule of Christian faith and practice, on the ground of which they ever argued against the papacy and condemned its errors in doctrines and morals. But they said, the Bible exists for everybody and is intended for everybody's use; it is a means of grace for all Christians, and yields its meaning directly to the pious consciousness through the influence of the Spirit of inspiration still breathing in and through it. The Reformers were, indeed, not entirely free from the medieval view of Scripture, as in the nature of the case they could not be; but in principle they had broken with it. And by means

of their conception of the universal destination and intelligibility of sacred Scripture, in consequence of which it ceased to be the exclusive possession of the priesthood and presently became the common property of the Church, they revolutionized the current ideas of revelation and of Christianity. Christianity ceased to be regarded as a *new law*, and came to be viewed more as the power of a new life, holding in organic union with Christ; and the ground of certitude for faith was no longer found in any outward infallible authority, whether of Church or Scripture, but in Christ Himself as apprehended immediately in consciousness. In fact, Christ Himself, as thus apprehended, became the supreme authority for Christian thought.

For the idea of infallibility in general the Reformers cared very little. Practically they often rejected this idea, not merely in its application to the Church, but in its application to the Bible as well. Luther doubted the infallibility of the canon. For some time he had no use for the Apocalypse, though later he somewhat modified his views in regard to this book; and he pronounced the Epistle of James an epistle of straw, because he did not find therein the doctrine of justification by faith; which shows that his judgment was determined, not by any outward authority, but solely by the contents of the sacred books. And he at times doubted the infallibility of the canonical books themselves; questioning, for example, the accuracy of the interpretation of some Old Testament passages in the New, as, for instance, that of Isa. 8: 18 in Heb. 2: 13; and accusing St. Paul of false reasoning in his allegorical explanation of Sarah and Hagar in the Epistle to the Galatians, of which he says that it is "*Zum Stich zu schwach*," although he allows that it may serve a good practical purpose in the way of edification. He also admits that, besides the gold, silver, and precious stones, which are contained in the writings of the prophets, there may be mixed in with them wood, hay, and stubble, whose end is to be consumed.* Zwingli and Calvin were equally free in their treatment of the Bible. The latter,

* See Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, Vol. VI. p. 695 (old ed.).

for example, freely admits that in matters of historical detail there may be inaccuracies; because the sacred writers, in matters of this kind, when no important consequences were involved, did not trouble themselves about entire precision. In subsequent times, indeed, especially from about the middle of the seventeenth century onward, under the stress of controversy, the old scholastic doctrine of Biblical infallibility was reinstated in Protestantism. The notion again prevailed that the Bible is a divine code whose propositions, if they were but rightly understood and rightly put together, would at once yield an infallible system of theology; and more than one school fancied that it had the right understanding of the Bible, and that its theology therefore must be infallible. But from the time that this change came over the mind of Protestantism, the victorious career of Protestantism was ended. Men felt somehow that if the religious question was one to be decided by an outward infallible authority, it was better to have the pope *and* the Bible on one's side, than simply to have the Bible alone. Has not this been one of the Achilles' heels of Protestantism for the last two hundred years?

We hold, then, that, by rejecting the notion of a mechanical infallibility as belonging to the Bible by virtue of its inspiration, together with that whole view of the Bible as a book of divine statutes which this notion implies, and substituting for this the conception of a vital spiritual energy inhering in the Word of God, and making it quick and powerful for the generating and developing of a spiritual life in the soul, there is not only nothing lost, but much gained. The latter conception is incomparably higher than the former, and makes the Bible now incomparably more valuable. For, as thus conceived, inspiration is a quality that belonged not merely to the original manuscripts of the sacred writers, but it is a quality that cannot be lost in any translation, and belongs, therefore, to every copy of the Bible that is now in the hands of the humblest Christian. Moreover, as thus conceived, the Bible ceases to be a book intended exclusively for the use of the priesthood, and shows itself to be

adapted to the understanding and edification of all Christians. As it no longer needs an infallible teacher to disclose its purpose, it needs no longer to be excluded from the hands and eyes of the laity, as is done consistently where the other conception prevails. And, finally, in this view, the Bible no longer fails to accomplish its object, but really answers the purpose for which it is intended. As a complete statutory revelation of commandments and doctrines the Bible must be considered a failure; for the best of men, with the best of intentions, have never yet agreed in the interpretation of it in this sense. But as a means of grace, intended for the quickening and development of the religious life in the soul, it has always and everywhere been successful. While it has failed in making infallible theologians or theologies, it has not failed in making Christians.*

The conception of inspiration here put forward relieves the Christian believer from all anxiety or concern about the authorship of the several books of the Bible. The question concerning the authenticity of these books is interesting in itself, but it has nothing to do with the question of inspiration. The quality of a work of art is not determined by the name of its author, but by what the work is in itself. If a statue be discovered in the ruins of an ancient city, its quality is determined by the evidence of the artistic character which it bears in itself, and not by the question as to who made it. And so a Biblical writing must bear in itself the evidence of its inspiration quite independently of any reference to the personality of the author. Modern criticism has made it evident to all scholars, who are not afraid to trust their senses, that Moses did not write the

* That the Bible has an office also to perform in the progressive evolution of theological thought in the Church is, of course, not to be denied, but affirmed. But the question as to the precise relation of the Bible to the progress of theological thought, or to the progressive formation of doctrines and dogmas, is a large one, and we cannot in this paper enter into a discussion of it. It is enough to have shown that the old method of using Scripture as though it were a legal code, which leads to such contradictory results in the hands of equally honest and pious men, must be erroneous.

Pentateuch, nor David the Psalter.* That matters not, so far as the inspiration of these books is concerned. They have always approved themselves to the Church as inspired, and they will continue to do so hereafter. There are at the present moment grave doubts about the authorship of the fourth Gospel; but these do not touch the question of its inspiration, nor of its value as disclosing the image of the divine-human Christ, in its highest and purest form, as it impressed itself upon the mind of the Apostolic Church.

This conception of inspiration, moreover, puts an end forever to the old battle between the Bible and science, and relieves the Christian apologist from carrying a burden that is becoming too heavy for him. With this view of inspiration and of the design of revelation, it is no longer necessary, for example, to maintain the literal accuracy of the account of the creation in Genesis, and then to perform impossible exegetical feats for the purpose of bringing it into harmony with incontestable facts of science, such as the identification of the six creative days with the various eras and epochs of geology; or to assume the literal historicalness of the narrative of the fall, and then to explain how it happened that Eve was left alone at the tree of temptation, how the serpent could address her in human speech, and what physical changes there occurred in the serpent after the pronouncement of the curse. Nor is it necessary any longer to accept the literal accuracy of the story of the flood, and then to exert our ingenuity to find out whence sufficient water could have been obtained to cover the whole earth to the depth of fifteen cubits above the tops of the highest mountains,

* Of course there is presupposed also a sufficient degree of ability and a sufficient amount of patience to follow the arguments of the critics. The trouble with many is that they allow themselves to pronounce judgment without possessing either. They cannot conceive, for example, how *they* could so analyze the Pentateuch as to determine various documents in it. They have read it and have never been struck by any documents in it; and, therefore, they sneer at the labor of the critics as mere child's play. That is as if one were to propose to decide questions of science, not by knowledge, but by ignorance. The writer knows nothing of the construction of a phonograph. If, therefore, he were to conclude that it is impossible to make a phonograph, and proclaim this conclusion to the world, he would make himself very ridiculous in the eyes of all sober people.

or to explain how the animals could have been brought unto Noah from all quarters of the globe, and how they could all be accommodated in the ark. We need no longer feel ourselves bound to explain discrepancies of historical statements by inventing imaginary circumstances of which we know absolutely nothing. How the angels could have had intercourse with the daughters of men; how the cony could be said to chew the cud; how Saul could have begun to reign over Israel at the tender age of one year (1 Sam. 13 : 1, Heb.); how it could have been at the same time Jehovah and Satan that stirred up David to number Israel (2 Sam. 24 : 1 ; 1 Chron. 21 : 1); how the blind Bartimeus of Jericho could have been two men as well as one (Mark 10 : 46 ; Matt. 20 : 30); how the one demoniac of Gadara could have developed into two (Mark 5 : 2 ; Luke 8 : 27 ; Matt. 8 : 28); how the name of one person could be exchanged for that of another without involving any error, as that of Isaiah for Malachi (Mark 1 : 2), or of Abiathar for Ahimelech (Mark 2 : 26 ; 1 Sam. 21 : 1), or of Jeremiah for Zechariah (Matt. 27 : 9 ; Zech. 11 : 12)—these and similar matters will no longer give us any serious concern. As the physical and historical errors in Shakespeare do not mar the æsthetic truth which Shakespeare meant to convey, or destroy the æsthetic or even the moral effect of his dramas, so any physical, historical, scientific, or ethical errors that may be found in the Bible, do not mar the religious truth which the Bible is intended to convey, or hinder its religious effect. And we shall, therefore, no longer be surprised when we are told even that some of those Bible narratives which serve as media for the inculcation of most precious religious truth—truth which needed to be inculcated particularly at the time when these narratives were composed—rest not upon literal history or fact, but upon popular legends and myths. Nor need we any longer worry when we find that the apostles, in quoting from the Old Testament, often quoted loosely from memory, and were not anxiously careful to preserve literal exactness, as a modern theologian would be; for the truth which they intended to communicate is not dead law, like that contained in the pages of the

Pandects, but living and life-giving spirit capable of exerting its power in more than one form of words.

Under this new conception of inspiration, which was substantially that of the Reformers, in distinction from that both of the earlier and later Scholasticism, the Bible ceases to be an infallible code of doctrines and precepts, directly let down from heaven, or an arsenal of infallible proof-texts, as it is perhaps still by too many regarded, and becomes a book of life—a medium, through the Spirit, of direct communion of the believing soul with the living and glorified Christ, who is Himself the only absolute and infallible authority for Christian faith and life. And in the end it is not the Bible that authenticates Christ to us, but Christ that authenticates the Bible.* We believe not in Christ on account of the Bible, but we believe the Bible on account of Christ. And Christ must be the ultimate Interpreter of Scripture, also—Christ in His people, or Christ in the Christian consciousness. He alone is the truth; and all the utterances and teachings even of prophets and holy men, though they should claim a “thus saith the Lord” for their authority, must at last be brought to the judgment-seat of Christ for revision and correction. Whatever is incompatible or inconsistent with the spirit of Christ, though it may be in the Bible, and may once have claimed the stamp of divine authority, cannot be identical with eternal divine truth, and must now be rejected. Such teaching, for example, as that contained in the imprecatory Psalms, and such sentiments as those expressed in passages like 1 Sam. 15: 2, and 2 Sam. 16: 10, must give way before the superior authority of the Sermon on the Mount. In the words of Luther, Christ is Lord also of the Bible; and we should be more anxious to hold with Christ, than to hold with the Bible; convinced, however, that if we have the mind of Christ, we shall also have the *true* mind that is in Scripture. If our faith be *Christian* it will be *Biblical*; but it may be biblical without being Christian; for it may have the letter, but lack the spirit of the Bible.

* “Das Ansehen der heiligen Schrift kann nicht den Glauben an Christum begründen, vielmehr muss dieser schon vorangesetzt werden um der heiligen Schrift ein besonderes Ansehen einzuräumen.” SCHLEIERMACHER.

IV.

THE TREND OF HISTORY.

BY REV. J. B. RUST, A.M.

IN observing the activities of the present age and musing upon those of departed centuries, the question naturally arises, Whither are we drifting? The perpetual movement of mankind makes for what goal? When and where will all the rays of race and national, political and religious coloring, which the past reflects into the present, which are cast by the present into the future, concentrate into a destiny achieved? What is the destiny of mankind? It is evident, if there be any truth in Revelation, touching the hope of man and the Divine intention concerning him, that the silent movement of the race from age to age, from discovery to discovery, from attainment to attainment, despite the incessant turmoil and struggle, the frequent wreck and failure along the path of time, and the subtle suspicion of a fateful flux, conceals a mighty march toward the realization of a high, an immortal purpose.

To discover the true philosophy of history, in answer to these inquiries, must ever remain one of the most important and difficult quests of the student. It is not only an interesting and profitable pleasure, but also possesses a practical bearing upon the spirit of the present and the events of the future. Whatever the student does, should be unselfishly done. The fruits of research, whenever they can advance the cause of enlightenment and benefit the race, ought to be made the possession of mankind. The better, the truer, the profounder man's knowledge is concerning himself, his place in nature, his rela-

tion to the past and to the future, the more rounded will be the life of each separate individual.

“ But words are things, and a small drop of ink
Falling, like dew, upon a thought, produces
That which makes thousands, perhaps millions think.” *

“ *Historia testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriæ, magistra vitæ, nuntia vetustatis.*” †

More than this, such study, by acting upon personal existence, not only hastens the advent of a great millennial era and the higher development of the moral consciousness of the brotherhood of man, but also the break of that day when the last shackle of superstition shall fall to the ground and the race, in a diviner sphere, shall enter upon the inheritance for which centuries of trial and yearning are fitting it, an inheritance free, from the stain of error and the sorrows of worldly captivity.

Pessimistic views of the condition of our times cannot be justified. They result from an insufficient knowledge or false interpretation of history, and exhibit a very limited appreciation of the achievements of modern social and religious life.

It is foolish and cowardly to despair of the power of truth, or by way of compromise to adopt a philosophy of history such as that advocated by Buckle, ‡ who, rejecting what he calls the metaphysical dogma of Free Will and the theological dogma of Predestined Events, undertakes to explain all the phenomena of society by the reciprocal influences of man and nature. “ Thus we have man modifying nature and nature modifying man ; while out of this mutual modification all events must necessarily spring.” Any theory may contain some grains of truth, but no such one-sided principle upon which is to be based an interpretation of the life of mankind will either satisfy the reason or do justice to the dignity of human hopes and the sentiment of an enlightened conscience. Notwithstanding certain unwarranted assumptions wildly suggested by the leading discoveries of modern science, it is utterly impossible to reduce

* Byron, *Don Juan*, Canto III. 88.

† Cicero.

‡ Buckle, *Hist. of Civilization in England*, Vol. I. p. 15.

the activities of the universe to the workings of a mechanism, however complex, a piece of machinery in which one wheel runs within another, nature the larger, man the lesser. Barring certain local changes, due on the one hand to sudden, unusual and oftentimes destructive outbursts of elemental forces, and on the other to the industry of civilized man, the state of nature as we find it now, has, in the main, been the same for unnumbered ages. The descriptions of the topography of early Britain and Germany, preserved in the writings of Latin historians, are in many instances exaggerated and fanciful, and can only be cited with the greatest discrimination as historic witnesses of the degree to which the hand of man may modify the order of things in the domain of nature. The Romans with their galleys explored only the rugged shores of those then distant islands, and formed their notion of the condition of the country from the appearance of the coast and the rude savages who with weapons of primitive construction sought to protect themselves against invasion. The soldier and the sailor here found most fruitful material for tales of wonder, with which, on their return, to regale the inhabitants of the Eternal City. An English historian says: "The shores of Britain were, to the polished race which dwelt by the Bosphorus, objects of mysterious horror, such as that with which the Ionians of the age of Homer had regarded the straits of Scylla and the Læstrygonian cannibals. There was one province of the island in which, as Procopius had been told, the ground was covered with serpents, and the air was such that no man could inhale it and live. To this desolate region the spirits of the departed were ferried over from the land of the Franks at midnight. A strange race of fishermen performed the ghastly office. The speech of the dead was distinctly heard by the boatmen; their weight made the keel sink deep into the water; but their forms were invisible to mortal eye." *

In the same way crude notions, that were handed down to succeeding ages, became current concerning the character of ancient

* Macaulay, *Hist. England*, Vol. I. p. 4.

Germany.* Latin writers, like Tacitus, Strabo and Seneca, describe that country as being rugged and wild and covered with swamps and impenetrable forests. The valleys of the Rhine were vast morasses, and marsh and woodland extended to the banks of the Elbe. Countless streams flowed in unfixed beds through the trackless wastes, and the atmosphere, charged with mist and fog, poured forth continuous rains. Great masses of ice and avalanches of snow rolled down from the mountain heights, burying horse and rider in one common ruin. Frequent earthquakes shook the towering Alps. The climate was so cold that the wine froze in the earthen vessels that contained it, and, bursting them, remained standing upon the ground in huge cakes of ice. Thus Germany came to be looked upon as the end of the world, fitted only to be the home of wild beasts.

Men accustomed to enjoy perpetual summer under an Italian sky readily created, adopted and promulgated these exaggerated ideas, owing in part to ignorance of the real state of nature in that day, and in part to the fact that the Romans carried on their campaigns principally in Friesland, Westphalia and along the coast of Hanover, where there is a great deal of marshland. Moreover, the Germans chose to fight their battles in forest and morass, because there they held their enemies at a disadvantage. But that the inland seas and the streams were no larger during the Roman invasions than they now are is proved by the remains of camps and bridges. Those regions that at the present time allow of the highest cultivation and are the most productive were just as fruitful, had they been husbanded, two thousand years ago. And in contradiction of the accepted opinion that ancient Germany was distinguished for perpetual cold, Pliny says the heat in summer often became so great that the Rhine would scarcely float a skiff.

Since the close of the glacial period, when the globe began to be habitable, nature assumed the fixed condition it now maintains. It is possible to trace a gradual shifting of the earth's axis, which has influenced the character and direction of the

* Barth, Hist. Germany, Vol. III., p. 7.

isothermal lines, and thus the migrations of birds and animals, and moved northward or southward the territorial boundaries of indigenous plants. But whatever scientific conclusions as to possibilities may be drawn therefrom, they do not in the least argue that any epochal modifications have been made upon man in the past, during the time the race has lived on the globe, other than those that have existed from dim antiquity, when they were first established.*

And when we compare the powers of man with the forces of nature, we discover the fact that, however permanent in their effect they appear to be, the victories of man over nature are not absolute, but only conditional. He builds great cities, adorning them with rich temples and magnificent palaces. By artificial canals he unites sea with sea. Sometimes he converts desert places into gardens. He undermines mountains and valleys in his search for precious metals. He constructs huge mausoleums for the dead, and commemorates his historic achievements with shafts of granite. But the giant forces of nature he vaunts himself to have set at bay reassert themselves with a maddened energy that laughs at the fruits of industry and genius. His cities are buried beneath the *débris* and lava hurled in seething masses from the crater of a volcano. An earthquake shatters his mines. A conflict of the elements of the air, and

* The effect of any speculation concerning the age of the human family, as related to the essentials of the Christian religion, is immaterial. In the first place, the chronology of the Old Testament fails to settle the question. Again, some of the leading spirits of the Early Church, who touched upon the subject in their discussions with the Gnostics, quite boldly declared the claim of certain heretics for a longer period to be tenable, without endangering the Catholic faith. A striking passage in the writings of Irenæus goes to show that the unscientific speculations of ancient scholars, *rather than the Hebrew Scriptures*, were to blame for the establishment of the literal interpretation of the Creation Days, which has received the scathing criticism of modern physicists. "And there are some, again, who relegate the death of Adam to the thousandth year." . . . "Whether, therefore, with respect to disobedience, which is death; whether, with respect to this cycle of days, they died on the day in which they did also eat; or whether he (Adam) did not overstep the thousand years, but died within their limit,—it follows that, in regard to all these significations, God is indeed true." (Irenæus, *Against Heresies*, Book V., chap. 23, art. 2.)

the roll of mighty waters sweeps away every vestige of his works of art, that the old order of things may reappear, in mingled ghastly and romantic wildness. The storm fades away, the oscillation ceases, and the sun again casts his rays upon him, but as a vagabond, as a beggar, as a dependent upon nature that does not own his dependence, and mockingly reminds him of his end by bidding him to gaze at the exhumed corpses whose graves he had honored with monuments of marble.*

In striking contrast with this theory of mutual modification, Lotze, one of the wisest philosophers of modern times, in grappling with the problem of human life, and preparing to give an answer to the questions that assail every meditative mind, presents this melancholy picture of terrestrial relations: "The further man drifts away from the patriarchal state of isolation, and the more conscious he becomes of the inexhaustible fruitfulness with which the earth for countless centuries has brought forth race upon race, varying greatly in form and disposition, and yet essentially moulded after the same type, yes, all of them in the character and conditions of their life resembling the animal species that in still greater number, appearing and disappearing by myriads, inhabit the most forgotten corners of the globe; the more distinctly this fact presents itself to the consciousness, the more timid will man be to begin to think about the value of his own existence, and the belief that he is merely one of the transitory phenomena which an eternal primitive force, reveling in creation and destruction, aimlessly calls forth and permits again to vanish, will take possession of his mind."† Whatever may have been the original design in the creation of the world, its present condition, one it has maintained for ages with but slight variation, betrays the fact that it is not intended, that it is not fitted to be the permanent abode of man.

It cannot be denied that the laws of nature act with marvelous precision throughout the universe, nor that they proclaim the existence of a Divine Mind of infinite wisdom that gave them birth. But if one should attempt on any theory whatso-

* Genesis iii. 17-20.

† Lotze, *Mikrokosmos*, Vol. II., p. 449.

ever, to confine the destiny of man wholly to his material relations, a problem in respect of the true end of human life, *defying solution*, would at once arise. For the very laws that obtain in the material world and daily challenge man's admiration, are alike life and death to him. And what they are for him, that are they also for all animals and plants. Hence, in a sense, the utterance of a celebrated scientist and historian must be conceded to be true: "The earth, though very beautiful, is very far from being perfect. The plants and animals we see are only the wrecks of a broken series, an incomplete and therefore unworthy testimonial of the Almighty Power."* It was some such impression as this that led to the formulation of the Manichæan philosophy, which, after the death of its author, found so wide an adoption among the Gnostic Christians, and existed in scattered societies as late as the Middle Ages. By reason of a plausible argument and a powerful array of traditional dualistic speculations adduced in its support, we need not wonder that the genius of Augustine, who in early life had himself been an advocate of its tenets, was incited to combat it. The idea that the natural world, morally speaking, is the enemy rather than the friend of man, undoubtedly gave occasion to the practice of asceticism, which already prevailed to some extent in heathen times and later on was introduced into the Christian Church. Whatever inability man may have to secure a purely material dominion over nature, the cause of his servile relation to his physical surroundings must not be sought in some inherent evil breathed into the world of matter by a demiurge. The insurmountable obstacles one meets with in attempting to adjust the facts of experience to a theory like that of mutual modification, result from the law of sin and death to which the whole creation somehow became subjected,† and make that theory not only untenable, but force one to seek for the key to the problem of life in some other philosophy, in some other sphere. It is true, in a way, that man, by reason of his intellectual and moral

* Draper, *Intel. Devel. of Europe*, Vol. II. p. 334.

† Romans viii. 13-24.

capabilities, stands at the head of all creation, but only then when these are given their proper place in the scale of being and the study of humanity. Otherwise man appears as only one of the passing phenomena of nature, perhaps the highest, all in all, but a product still. For from a physiological point of view, "the orang-outang resembles the human both externally and internally. His brain is moulded like ours. He has a broad chest, wide shoulders, a face and a skull constructed similar to ours. His heart, lungs, liver, spleen, stomach and intestines are like ours. Tyson named forty-eight parts that man has in common with the ape. And in the things he is said to do, his vices and follies even, perhaps also the periodicity of his diseases, he resembles man. Therefore it is to be expected that there exists something human-like in the activities of his soul. The beaver builds his dams in obedience to instinct. He was created for that purpose. Beyond that he cannot go. He is incapable of association with man, of sharing his thoughts and passions. But the ape no longer possesses a determining instinct. His powers of thought lie very near the line of reason, in the humble sphere of imitation. He imitates everything, and therefore his brain must be constituted to make countless combinations of sensual ideas, of which no other animal is capable. Neither the wise elephant nor the trusty dog can accomplish what he can. He strives to perfect himself, but in vain. The door is locked. He is unable to associate ideas." *

Huxley says: "Whatever system of organs be studied, the comparison of their modifications in the ape series leads to one and the same result—that the structural differences which separate man from the gorilla and chimpanzee are not so great as those which separate the Gorilla from the lower apes." † But in order to correct any misrepresentation of opinions which might indicate that the structural differences between man and even the highest apes are small and insignificant, he adds: "Every bone of a Gorilla bears marks by which it might be distinguished

* Herder, *Ideas to Philosophy of History*, p. 120.

† Huxley, *Man's Place in Nature*, p. 123.

from the corresponding bone of a man, and in the present creation at any rate no intermediate link bridges over the gap between Homo and Troglodytes."

Thus we finally arrive at the conclusion that no philosophy which ignores the spiritual side of mankind, is capable of offering a satisfactory solution of the problem of history. Natural History simply shows us a being superior in instincts and achievements to all created things, but a being too that is subjected to an inexorable physical law which obtains throughout the universe of matter, the law of birth, growth and death, unchangeably the same midst all surroundings as to the common end. For surroundings, though they may augment the miseries of existence, or modify and assuage them, do not shift the course of fate nor stop its march. One individual after another involuntarily leaps into existence, lives through a series of years and scenes, and then, though reared midst the action of the proudest civilization, passes away.

We take great pride in the progress of the nineteenth century, the inventions, discoveries and conveniences of our modern life. But these treasured fruits of science and peace are after all simply compromises with nature and do not alter in the least the ultimate lot of man. They only cast an air of refinement about his fate. Misfortune, discord, terrible diseases and death, despite all these, still continue to invade the palace and the hovel. Here and there voices from the abyss of Naturalism strive to grow eloquent over a creature divested by theory of all spiritual dignity, such as is reflected from man even in the lowest stages of degradation and savagery because of the end for which he was made. Their eloquence is mimicry, hollow and hopeless. It is devoid of great thoughts that train the emotions, move the soul, and speak to it of better things to come. What mean the threnodies which are forced from families, tribes and nations as the years and the centuries roll on? Are we cursed with yearnings, with hopes, with the power of thought, with conscience, with desires to touch, if no more, only the garment's hem of a higher life, or with the strange thralldom of iniquity

and guilt, a very hell on earth, to learn for ourselves and to teach others, that we are superior in rank among the products of Nature, but for the rest only rise to the surface of the sea of oblivion to catch a fleeting glimpse of a shimmering sheen and then sink back again into its dark and noiseless depths? Is there no healing voice anywhere in the universe whose recorded wisdom disentangles the web of human experience, resolves life into its proper relations, sends into it the angel of hope and reveals to the race the true dignity and end of being? We need not seek long to find an utterance, and one whose testimony is both divine and conclusive. "And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him; and he opened his mouth and taught them, saying: Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."* The witness of this Voice, not only here but elsewhere also, covers the whole ground of inquiry and bridges the chasm of doubt and theory which any philosophy that ignores the spiritual in man, can neither lessen in width nor sweep away. It speaks to us of possibilities that lie open to human attainment, and in the realization of which, man's nature, whether in individual form, as a nation or as a race, finds its perfection and ultimate glorification.

This is the key to the philosophy of history. The "terrible

* Matthew v. 1-13.

fallen" of man's nature proves it to be so. "Formed out of the dust of the ground, yet made in the image and similitude of God: children of the Most High, yet crushed before the most drinking iniquity like water, yet filled with the inspiration of the Almighty which giveth him understanding; a worm and a thing of naught, yet with a destiny higher than the sons of light: the angel has him by the hand, or the serpent by the heart: he may rise to the heights of heaven, he may sink to the abyss of hell." *

The trend of history proves it. Whatever scientists may determine with reference to man's relation, physically, to the phenomena of nature; whatever order in the scale of existences may be assigned to him by naturalism, the march of events from the earliest times to the present hour, as interpreted by the aid of "the Light which shineth in darkness," establishes the fact that the destiny of man is not limited to earthly duration nor confined to mutual modifications of a material kind, but beginning here, extends beyond this lower sphere and finds its fulfillment in the realm of the ideal, in the land of the true, the beautiful and the good:

The word progress as applied to the improvement of human conditions, comprehends every true advance made from time to time, in the training of the faculties of the soul, in leading society further and further away from that brutal, selfish, helpless, warlike, crude and defenceless state, both morally and physically, in which man at some time during his existence on the globe, began a career. It does not lie within the scope of this writing to discuss the manner in which, nor the time when this defection from a broader, a nobler and a more beautiful line of life occurred. If higher purposes than any that are now universal are to find expression in man, he has passed through a period of degeneracy, the effects of which must be overcome if he shall attain not only to what has been lost, but rise above it and find his true home with God.

The history of the race, as far as we know it, and our own

* Farrar, *The Fall of Man and Other Sermons*, p. 90.

experience as members of it, our individual conflicts, aims and hopes, prove two things. The first is, that human society has not been and is not now what it ought to be. The second is, that from all the ages of men the principle of growth has not been absent. To whatsoever degree we may be amazed in this century of wonders, at the many puerile things of the past, the devastation, the superstition, the infantile dreams that entered into its activities, many of which are still with us, we must see that the idea of the good, the true and the beautiful slowly—for so deep is the degeneracy, so wide the defection—has been incorporating itself in mankind. However great may be the weight of these false notions and the monumental ignorance of the larger portion of the race; however depressing the erroneous views born of barbarism and paganism, the trend of history, though apparently checked and dissipated at times by overshadowing events which struck the world dumb with darkness, has been onward and upward, away from the narrow domain of bondage, in the direction of liberty in all the elements that enter into human life. Scarcely a century passed by but some link was broken, some shackle was hurled aside, some eye was opened. Like the fabled Leviathan rising from the sea and shaking the earth with the majesty of his tread, man comes forth from the floods of time, and under the guidance of the Logos in history, gradually grows into the knowledge of his dignity,* and becomes conscious of an eternal spiritual purpose.

There are two elements in which, and two lines of life along which this growth has been and will continue to be made, touching the real needs of man and the march of destiny. These are religion and civil government, or the conditions of organized society.

We place the element of religion first, because in point of time it is the older, and in importance the greater. Religion has so intimate a connection with human life that by it one can determine both the character and degree of civilization and culture which have been attained by individuals, a school of

*John iii. 16.

teachers or a nation. It influences every important art, as well as all the relations of private and social intercourse. In its full development it holds everything else in subordination to itself. As its birth dates back to human beginnings, so is the consummation of destiny inseparably connected with it. We do not speak of religion in an arbitrary sense, meaning thereby a certain code of philosophical precepts, or some one system of dogmas. The word as here used refers to that instinct in human nature which in any form and in any degree whatsoever, from the most degraded Fetishism to the highest type of spirituality in the Kingdom of Grace, involuntarily, by force of circumstances or through divine intervention, asserts the existence of the supernatural. Thus it includes not only beliefs, but practices; not only spiritual capacity and wants, but also every kind of effort made to cultivate and satisfy these.

I.

The Orient is the birth-place of religion. There where man first began to live, he also first began to worship. Leaving out of account for the present the sacred books of the Jews, the history of religions tells us that the earliest forms of worship common among the Gentile nations, not excepting even the Egyptians, were rude and simple, and consisted chiefly of sacrifices and prayers addressed to mysterious powers believed to be embodied in the objects of nature. "Now it must be that many of the qualities which objects of the material world in primitive times were thought to possess, had been reflected back upon them from the feelings which those objects stirred in the beholder. The high thing was endowed with moral qualities, because looking upward aroused some moral thoughts. In truth it would seem that the great fetish gods of the early world were three, and three only—the tree, the mountain and the river. Lesser fetishes take their holiness from the greater—the stone from the mountain, the branch or the block of wood from the tree. But such lesser fetishes were not worshiped in the prime of fetishism. They are simply survivals. The difference be-

tween early fetishism and late superstition is only in name. The Portuguese sailor prays to his fetish—the word is of Spanish origin—to save him from shipwreck, because he believes that he is somehow thus influencing an unseen Being who has power over the winds and the waves.* The African, too, has a notion of such an Unseen Being when he prays to his gri-gri to save him from the storm. Had he no such notion, he would pray to the winds and waves themselves not to drown him.”†

Though we cannot with our enlightenment obtain a realizing sense of the spiritual condition of these primitive people, we can readily see that it must have been extremely limited and of a very low order. The state of language, of manners and customs was also commensurate with it. That period can be called the poetic age and may be compared to the innocence and prattling inexperience of childhood. But it is a sad and humble picture to gaze upon, while there ring in our ears traditions that have come down from dim antiquity, traditions of a Golden Age when man walked with God and evil was a theory; when instead of groping about in the recesses of deep dark caverns for but one ray of light, he stood on the mountain tops of being and cast a long satisfying look into the radiance of eternity; when he asked no questions, but simply communed face to face with the All-Father. It is a sad picture! It was a sadder state! But with *it* began the trend of history.

To this day the veneration of animals is practiced in India. **This** form of worship stands next in order to Fetishism and is **the** result of experience, and rather a compromise than a **creation**. In process of time, when men were once taught to distinguish between the talisman and its bearer, mysterious powers and their prophets, by the discovery of foibles, weaknesses and deceptions, they had recourse to another means for the purpose

* The Chinese sailors when about to make a voyage, go to their priests and purchase written prayers which are believed to be efficacious in procuring deliverance from danger. The writer possesses such a talisman or fetish, which was found by a friend on a street in San Francisco, where it had evidently been lost by its owner.

† Keary, *Primitive Belief*, p. 85.

of appeasing the religious instinct.* The animals which surrounded them, both those that had been domesticated and those that ran wild in the forests and inhabited the streams, were deified. It was impossible to fathom the mystery of their being. They gave no sign by which their inner life could be read. It was but natural that a broken faith should recrystallize itself around these mute denizens of the lower world—the dog, the horse, the bird, the elephant, the tiger, the ape, the crocodile and the serpent. Moreover, this form of religion received a new impulse from Pythagoras, who under a modified phase, assigned it a place in his philosophy, when he enunciated the doctrine of the transmigration of souls.

Out of the worship of the phenomena of nature, after the tree Yggdrasyl or Ohdinn's ash, the Haoma of the Mazdeans, the Soma of the Hindu Aryans and the amritam—ambrosia—extracted from its leaves, had become historic as objects of veneration, grew the polytheism which is more or less characteristic of all the religions of antiquity, including the beliefs of the Germanic tribes of a later day.† Henotheism, a word coined by Max Mueller, describes that form of religion in which the fetish-worshiper adored the powers of nature—any elemental display—while in action, and forgot them when that ceased, making no distinction between the prayers addressed to the whirlwind, the storm or the thunder-cloud. In Polytheism these powers are personified and receive a permanent form. The mountains are made the habitation of gods possessing the attributes of men, their emotions, their purposes, a strength like, but surpassing theirs and exercised through the mystic gift of magic. The forests are peopled with fauns, satyrs and fairies; the rivers and seas with nymphs, dryads and mermaids. In the storm Cyclops, the Chimera and furies sweep the earth with devastation. In the dawn Demeter, the earth-mother, at regular intervals pours out her favor upon mankind.

Among the Greeks and Romans polytheism reached its

* Lotze, *Mikrokosmos*, Vol. III. p. 339.

* Lenormant, *Beginnings of History*, p. 88.

climax. Every family had its household divinity. The acts of private life were controlled by its spirit. All the utensils of labor and trade were dedicated to the Penates. Important plans were undertaken only after consultation of the oracles. The massive and beautiful temples of the ideal Greeks and the war-like Romans, owed their erection to the influence of this highly imaginative faith. The conception of one, true and living God, the Maker of heaven and earth, was as little present here as in preceding ages. No wonder that the words of Saint Paul on Mars' Hill: "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you"—excited doubt, contempt and animosity in his pagan listeners.* With a single heroic utterance he put to shame those idle fancies, those "gods many and lords many," and, without disturbing their architectural beauty, swept away the false religious foundation of their temples.

Polytheism in its Grecian type, despite the lack of a pure moral ideal and the knowledge of a universal Divine Essence—apart from the speculations of a few great philosophers—presents an example of an unparalleled development in this direction. Aside from the dearth of true spirituality, which more enlightened minds must deplore, there is a captivating charm about this ancient mythology. Owing in part to this and in part to his hatred of the Nazarene, even after Constantine had declared Christianity imperial, Julian, the Apostate, made an effort to restore the worship of the gods. But their day was over. To idealize them by philosophy could not save them. "The upper classes were destitute of faith, yet terrified at skepticism. Their official religion was a decrepit Theogony; their real religion was a vague and credulous fatalism, which disbelieved in the existence of the gods, or held with Epicurus that they were careless of mankind. All men joined in the confession that the 'oracles were dumb.' It hardly needed the wail of mingled lamentations as of departing deities which swept over the astonished crew of the vessel off Palodes to

* Acts xvii. 28.

assure the world that the reign of the gods of Hellas was over—that 'Great Pan was dead.' " *

Many a one who failed to grasp the all-absorbing truths of Christianity, has been led to lament the awakening of the human mind from its poetic dream during the reign of the ancient gods, as if the beautiful in nature and in man could not be cherished and immortalized in any other way. Among great men the German poet, Schiller, is a most notable example of this tendency. His writings are full of noble sentiment, imbibed in early youth at a pious mother's knee, and by them one is taught to love the virtuous and the beautiful more deeply. But nearly all of them make one feel that Schiller lived in a by-gone age. His ideals were Grecian.

Da ihr noch die schöne Welt regiertet,
An der Freude leichtem Gängelband
Glücklichere Menschenalter führtet,
Schöne Wesen aus dem Fabelland!
Ach! da euer Wonnedienst noch glänzte,
Wie ganz anders, anders war es da!
Da man deine Tempel noch bekränzte,
Venus Amathusia!

Wo jetzt nur, wie unsere Weisen sagen,
Seelenlos ein Feuerball sich dreht,
Lenkte damals seinen goldenen Wagen
Helios in stiller Majestät.
Diese Höhen füllten Oreaden,
Eine Dryas starb mit jenem Baum,
Aus den Urnen lieblicher Najaden
Sprang der Ströme Silberschaum.

Schöne Welt, wo bist du? Kehre wieder,
Holdes blüthenalter der Natur!
Ach nur in dem Feenland der Lieder
Lebt noch deine goldene Spur.
Ausgestorben trauert das Gefilde,
Keine Gottheit zeigt sich meinem Blick,
Ach! von jenem lebenswarmen Bilde
Blieb nur das Gerippe mir zurück.

* Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, p. 8.

Alle jene Blüten sind entfallen
Von des Nordes winterlichem Wehn,
Einen zu bereichern, unter allen,
Musste diese Götterwelt vergehn.
Trauerig such' ich an dem Sternenbogen,
Dich, Selene, find' dich dort nicht mehr ;
Durch die Wälder ruf' ich, durch die Wogen,
Ach ! sie widerhallen leer !

* * * *

Da die Götter menschlicher noch waren,
Waren Menschen göttlicher.

In Egypt the religious instinct found expression in a way that differed widely from the mythology of the Greeks, though both systems of worship may have originated from similar causes. Only the Hellenes idealized the human form and the passions of the soul, whereas the ancient Egyptians sought to find in their images visible expression of the powers they saw at work around them, and of the Unseen Infinite that boundless space suggested to them. They were worshippers of the heavenly bodies, the regularity of whose movements during many dynasties impressed them with the vastness of the universe. And hence we find that the gods of Egypt were more fanciful in construction than those of Greece. In form they bordered on the monstrous, revealing the underlying idea that the less human in appearance, the nearer did they believe them to approach an adequate expression of the divine realities. The mysterious in nature, the principle of life, the passage of time, the relation of the soul to the universe as a part of it, entered more deeply into the religion of the people along the Nile and the Indus, than into that of any occidental nation of ancient times.

We have aimed to show that the change made by mankind in early ages, from Fetishism to Polytheism, did not consist merely in an elaboration of details, but that, though meager and far removed from truth, it was indicative of progress. These never did and never could of themselves develop the true conception

of God. But the passage from the one to the other is a step, though negative it may be, toward that end, for all the while men were learning something. Moses did not despise the wisdom of the Egyptians, whose priests, without disturbing the popular faith, gave birth to the science of astronomy. And Reuchlin, in the sixteenth century—the second leader of the German humanists—placed such value upon the Hebrew and the Greek languages that the valiant and victorious battle he waged in their defense against the monks, “identified the cause of the Reformation in the minds of the German youth with that of classical learning.”* And Herder, some centuries later, did not fear to say that there was but one Greece and but one Greek language, and that these never again will reappear in the history of the race.

Though we may be able to trace a degree of progress in the religions of the ancient Gentile nations, that progress in each one of them at a certain period came to a final close, because there was no possibility of a further unfolding. True spiritual enlightenment was wanting, and hence those faiths assumed a form which, with slight variation, they maintained for thousands of years. The Brahminical Reformation under Buddha is an example of such a change.†

Among all the religions of the ancient world, Judaism alone possessed and preserved the moral idea, which, acting as a leaven, superseded Paganism, and, beginning to assert itself at a time when the worship of idols in the most learned nations of antiquity had become effete, exerted that influence to which is owing all later progress on the part of mankind in the direction of religious enlightenment. “As compared with neighboring peoples in the old world, the Hebrews appear insignificant. Their country was small. The part they played on the stage of history

* Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, Vol. I, p. 299.

† “The innovation (*Neuerung*) made by Buddha was a revolution in the sphere of religion which one can with some justice compare to the relation between Christianity and Judaism, and which had an incalculable influence on the civilization of central Asia.” (Göll, *Mythology*, p. 319.)

was very humble, for they were seldom victors. And yet, through the will of destiny and a concatenation of circumstances whose causes can easily be traced, they have exercised a greater influence than any other Asiatic people. Yes, to a large degree through Christianity as well as Mohammedanism, they have become the basis of the greater part of the world's enlightenment."*

But Judaism superseded paganism only then when the Hebrews had fulfilled the positive side of their mission as a nation. Christianity adopted the sacred books of the Jews, breathed into them a new life and interpreted them with the help of a broader spirit, so that their teachings were merged into the precepts, promises and claims of the Founder of Christianity. The universality of the Roman government and an era of comparative peace gave the disciples of Christ the opportunity to carry His tenets to all parts of the then known world, and to proclaim His mission even in the isles of the sea. By and by a political phase manifested itself in the history of Christianity. Its cause was championed by Constantine the Great, who, to make himself more secure upon the throne, and to prolong the existence of the Roman Empire, sought the support of the adherents of this faith, but proved his religious insincerity and political craftiness by the numerous murders he committed, by his pretended adoption of the views of Arius and by his doubtful death. His policy, however, broadly taken, laid the foundation of the Roman Church, whose clergy at the fall of the empire obtained control of all state and municipal affairs, and maintained that control almost unchallenged for a thousand years. Whatever corruptions and abuses were developed in that communion by so long a lease of power, and however much we may condemn many practices which became prevalent, there can be no doubt that an end was accomplished by the institution of the Papacy, in the advancement of mankind, which possibly could have been attained by no other means. The political ascendancy of the Church broke certain prejudices and changed certain conditions peculiar to pagan society, which would otherwise have seriously

* Herder, *Philosophy of History*, Part III, p. 50.

hindered the progress of enlightenment. This admission is to be understood in a relative and limited sense. Notwithstanding all the abuses, the presence of the Church asserted the existence of a Divine Ruler, a divine law and an authority higher than brute force.* Despite the many glaring inconsistencies presented by her history, the scandals, the oppression of which she made herself guilty, the influence of the moral idea at the foundation of her institutions and the unity for which she contended, finally resulted in the abolition of villenage and slavery in Europe.† The Roman Church did not only support her sentiment in favor of human equality by throwing open her offices, honors and emoluments to all classes of men, irrespective of social standing, but at many a synod she legislated against the slave trade as utterly opposed to that sentiment. And under the guidance of Providence she fulfilled a mission which prepared the way in her own bosom for a higher stage of civilization in Europe. But a long period of inanity, corruption, tyranny and simony, coupled with the want of moral courage to reform these abuses, led at last to the triumph of *Christian individualism*. That equality which she had established and defended in human society, now that she proved recreant to her trust and in obedience to the will of a corrupt priesthood undertook to check the tide of time, asserted itself in the Reformation. Appeal was taken from the decrees of Rome, and the moral idea, on the banners of a new social order, again laid hold of the hearts of men. *Verbum Dei manet in æternum*! The youth had grown into a man, and, having become conscious of his prerogatives, declared his independence. Whatever weaknesses, either from a churchly or secular point of view, Protestantism may possess, in the battle for liberty of conscience and for a closer harmony with the spiritual models of the New Testament, as against the assumptions of ecclesiasticism, its cause and spirit are far in advance of Roman Catholicism. It must be granted that the sectarian tendencies and segmentation which have been

* Guizot, *History of Civilization*, Vol. I, p. 54.

† Macaulay, *History of England*, Vol. I, p. 14.

developed by the former do not meet the purpose of Christ touching the unity of His Church. But we may look away from this unhappy condition in the great families of the Reformation; away from the determined counter-array of the two vast hosts, Protestant and Roman, which was without doubt brought about for some wise purpose known to God, and may rest our eyes upon the rich foreshowings of the future, as we trustfully await the fulfillment of the Master's glorious promise, that there shall be one fold and one shepherd.*

II.

That the trend of mankind makes for the ideal and that the destiny of the race lies in that realm, is also proved by the growth of civil government. Since the most of us live more for the present than either in the past or in the future, excepting as things done or things hoped for touch our own selfish interests, we do not appreciate the magnitude of the changes which have been wrought in political ideas and in the constitution of human society. Neither do we weigh the importance of the questions that have been and that will be solved in connection with the progress of civil government. In discussing the labor problem, the race question, the threatened tyranny of the many, followed by the reverse of the social order, a leap from one extreme to the other, in which the bourgeois, the rabble, will be on top, and nature's noblemen at the bottom, we forget former conditions. How humble were the beginnings of society! Through how many phases has it passed! How checkered has been its career! It has taken centuries to achieve the measure of liberty which men now enjoy. For hundreds, perhaps thousands, of years after the earliest manifestation of government around the family altar, erected to the household deity, had disappeared, the patriarchal form of society existed, and nomadic tribes, ruled by chiefs, contended against one another for the spoils of victory. With the building of cities and the birth of industries, provincial monarchies made their advent,

*John x. 16.

and the principle of hereditary rule and arbitrary right held sway from the days of Nebuchadnezzar, Solon and Lycurgus, Romulus and Remus, down to the time when Napoleon, intoxicated with the idea of universal power, threatened all Europe with his sceptre. Sometimes the scene was varied with the founding of an aristocracy or an oligarchy. Men did not then speak of states, but of empires, and the people were the property of kings and lived at the mercy of their rulers. When regicides occurred, they were usually instigated by members of the royal family, by the jealousy of the legions, or the ambition of the nobility. The Democracies of Greece, one of the few attempts in ancient times to establish popular government, defeated their own purpose. "In their most prosperous and palmy times they (the Greeks) were always complaining; discord and hatred prevailed between all the cities without, and in every separate city within. They gave laws to the old Romans, who before that time had none; but their own were so bad for themselves that they were continually changing them. What could be said in favor of a government under which the just Aristides was banished, Phocion put to death, Socrates condemned to drink hemlock after having been exposed to banter and derision on the stage by Aristophanes, and under which the Amphyctions, with contemptible imbecility, actually delivered up Greece into the power of Philip, because the Phocians had ploughed up a field which was part of the territory of Apollo?" *

And yet the Hellenic people, who destroyed themselves by their political follies, taught after ages most valuable lessons in polity. Aristotle is the father of the science of government, and enunciated many principles which mankind were slow to grasp, but which in a younger day have exercised a regenerating influence upon society.

The Roman government, but when it was too late, when imperial power could no longer maintain the bond which had been established between the cities of different dependencies,

* Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary*, p. 392.

for the people of that empire lived in cities, and rural life, excepting in their immediate neighborhood, was unknown; when the barbarians with their repeated incursions threatened to subvert her martial dominion, undertook the plan of founding a confederacy. There is in existence a rescript of the emperors Honorius and Theodosius the Younger, addressed to Agricoli, Prefect of the Gauls, in the fifth century, discussing the advisability of introducing a new, an important, a defensive feature into the government, that of permitting deputies or delegates to be sent to the halls of state to represent the interests of their several localities.* But a variety of causes, the weakened condition of the empire on the one hand, and the growing hatred of its yoke on the other, among the people in the provinces, contributed to the defeat of the plan. Both the republic and the empire contained elements that wrought their ruin. As in the Greek democracies, so here, the disposition, the social condition, both of the governing and the governed classes, despite some very wise laws, led to disintegration and left the world free for the formation of new governments. Though it is a mooted question how far the Roman law influenced the people who were delivered from its positive authority at the fall of the Empire, and how much of it has been retained to this day by the leading nations of Europe, the Roman municipal system, the manner of regulating the affairs of cities, introduced by that government, has never been lost. Thus, after the lapse of centuries, we find the modern world related, as if by kinship, to the institutions of the Cæsars.


What were the conditions of society, which proved to be insurmountable obstacles to the ancient governments of Europe, during their sway, and when, by artificial stimulation, they sought to maintain their perpetuity? They were in the main the same that now exist in India and China. Gross ignorance and rudeness did not alone characterize the masses in those ages, but society itself was such that liberty could not at all, or only to an insignificant degree, be made the boon and possession

* Guizot, *History Civilization*, Vol. I., p. 45.

of the people, who had been born and bred the victims of distorted and tyrannical circumstances. It was the lack of civil equality; it was serfdom, slavery, the disgrace imputed to labor, which stood in the way of progress, which was held there by the unholy power of a traditional custom as old as the selling of Joseph into Egypt.

The Christian religion was in existence five hundred years before any perceptible change occurred in the disposition of mankind. Though outward forms of life were Christian, the institutions of society still preserved their pagan identity. In the fifth century, just before the fall of the Roman Empire, labor began to liberate itself. Prior to that time the different trades were followed by slaves. Just how or when this new departure occurred is not known. But the appearance of free artisans at the close of the Roman civilization was indicative of improvement in the social condition of the masses, even though it met with serious embarrassment, and in some parts of Europe was wholly obliterated again during the unproductive, unprogressive centuries of the Middle Ages and the feudal system, when the modern nations of Europe were slowly but surely crystalizing into being, out of the wreck of the Roman law and the institutions of Charlemagne.

The Feudal system was an anomaly in the history of European civilization. Squatter sovereignty on this continent before the War of the Rebellion, bore some resemblance to it. But to feudalism is owing the social elevation of woman. We do not deny that the Christian religion from its very birth, as far as its teachings are concerned, contended for the liberation of the female portion of mankind. Nevertheless, it sought the souls of men first, and for the rest taught them to submit to existing orders; to watch and to pray until the cloud should break and the kingdom of heaven should find recognition on earth. It adapted itself to circumstances, often only too much so, and worked as a leaven. However, we saw that society, though outwardly Christian, was inwardly pagan. When once the feudal castle led to the discovery of the true worth and office of



woman, the religion of Christ could attach itself to knight-errantry, since the valorous crusader bore upon his breast-plate the symbol of the cross, and in his heart the image of a noble woman; could infuse itself into the songs of the Minnesingers, and prepare the way for the Christian home of modern society.

Some historians describe the Crusades as supreme follies, perpetrated by a fanatic and credulous age. We may deplore the fact that the followers of Peter the Hermit, numbering two hundred and twenty-five thousand men, unorganized, unaccounted, accompanied by but four horses, and preceded by a goat and a goose, should attempt so prodigious an undertaking as the conquest of Jerusalem. We may view with pity the results of a journey that not only ended disastrously in a military sense, but whitened the road "leading through Hungary to the East" with a long line of ghastly bones, yet the truth remains that the Crusades aroused Europe from its lethargy, and by bringing its people into contact with oriental civilization, created the renaissance and led to the Revival of Learning.

If we ask what, from this time on, caused the amazing gain in the momentum of occidental civilization, and has made the last four hundred years, with all the bloodshed they chronicle, with a Philip of Spain, a Margaret of Parma, a Richelieu, a Marat, and a Robespierre, the most productive, the noblest in sixty centuries,—the answer is at once at hand. It was the influence of letters. It was the birth of science. The awakening of the human mind in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, resulted in the establishment of universities and schools all over Europe. "As its first vernal influences chased away the cold mists of ignorance and superstition, a thousand intellects sprang into freedom, and a thousand utterances burst into eloquence and song." It is no idle tale to say that the literary treasures of the past gave energy to a whole continent, and redeemed the stagnation of a thousand years.

Superstition, it seems, is an impediment to social progress which lingers longest on the earth. What tyrants are to the body, it is to the soul of man. They can destroy the former

without touching the spiritual entity. But superstition, like sin, seizes, chokes and devours the best there is in life, conscience and character, happiness and peace. But the physicists, whatever other proud and inconsequential boasts they may make, have given it a staggering blow, under which it is reeling toward the abyss from whence it sprang.

Let us pause now and contemplate the achievements of the centuries!

In the wake of the destruction of slavery and the elevation of woman in the western part of Europe, the Revival of Learning and the Reformation, has followed the establishment of constitutional government in England and Italy; in Germany and France, in Brazil and Japan. Since 1848 Grecian soil has been free, and Athens, once the glory of the Hellenic Isles, but which in 1832 could boast of only a few new wooden houses, one or two more solid structures and a bazaar composed of sheds, has in fifty years grown into a city of 50,000 inhabitants, the Piræus numbering 30,000 more. And in expenditures for educational interests, the government of which it is the capital leads the van among the nations of the globe. "What a change, when we consider that fifty years ago not a book could be bought in Athens!"*

And in the forefront of this vast array stands a civilization which, though the youngest, is not only the peer, but the superior of any in the wide, wide world.

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing :
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountain side
Let freedom ring !

My native country, thee—
Land of the noble free—
Thy name I love :
I love thy rocks and rills,

* Timayenis, History of Greece, Vol. II, p. 412.

Thy woods and templed hills,
My heart with rapture thrills
Like that above.

Our fathers' God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us with Thy might,
Great God, our King!

These institutions of ours were dearly bought, and the blood of many within the memory of men still living was spilled to maintain them. Some evils which afflicted us have been dissipated. Under God we will uproot the remaining ones. Nevertheless, we do not stand afar off, as did Moses on Nebo, yearning after a taste of freedom, for we already enjoy its energies and its blessings. With our own eyes we see what Christianity, enlightenment and liberty do; aye, what they will do. Education and free industry have given us our society. Science has taught us that the forests, the mountain-tops and the seas are not inhabited by spectral divinities. It has driven witchcraft from the land and dispelled the degrading faith in omens. It has broadened the mind to receive the sublime fact that the material universe is one great organic whole, under the control of absolute law. Thus is repeated, in the Occident, divested of the mysteries of idolatry, the conception of the East. Here lies the limit of physical science. But the Christian sees in this universal law an expression of the Will of the Ancient of Days, and fleeing the superstitions of the past and proclaiming the healing promises of the Master, with head erect and heart unbound, pursues his course into the future. This is the spirit, these are the elements of our civilization. They contain somewhat of the ideal,—the true, the beautiful and the good.

We stand in the dawn, and its golden rays cast a prophetic light upon us. Our civilization touches one shore of the Pacific

Main. Along the other lie the countries in which man began his existence. The trend of history is onward. The power that makes for righteousness will encircle the globe, and establish a confederation of the world. When that comes to pass, this will in truth be the outer-court of the Temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. And the regenerate nations, rushing beneath the lifted veil into the Gardens Beautiful, will find their destiny before the Face of the All-Father, and an unending bliss in the harmonies of the City that hath Foundation.

V.

PERSONAL CONSECRATION TO CHRIST.

BY REV. J. G. NOSS.

THERE are two prerequisite conditions in order to personal consecration to Christ. The first of these is *oneness* with Him. Devotion to any being from another, in any sphere, is possible only on the basis of their oneness; and the nature of the oneness determines the character of such devotion. The lowest form of devotion in the sphere of nature is grounded, of course, on the basis of the animal life. One animal can be devoted to another, not only of its own species, but even to one of different instincts and disposition, because of the common basis between them in the animal nature. On the same ground also can an animal be devoted to a human being. But an animal cannot in the same way be devoted to a stone or a tree on the one hand, nor to anything beyond the sphere of the physical on the other. A dog may lay down his life for his master, while living, or pine to death over his grave when dead, but such devotion, both subjectively and objectively can have as its basis only the *sarx*, for here only is there oneness between the two. The dog cannot be devoted to any intellectual or moral attribute in the master, for want of a common basis; and such devotion, therefore, can have no moral quality. The master may be grossly ignorant and immoral, or the opposite, the devotion is the same.

Where the *psyche* and the *sarx* together constitute the basis, as in the human being, there may be devotion in three directions: to the animal, to a fellow-human being, and, not to God, but to that which the merely psychical man can know of God. Man's devotion to the animal can only be partial and limited

because the basis between them is only common in part. There is no ground present in the animal upon which all the human psychical forces can be fully, freely and responsively exercised. Man's devotion to his fellow-man can be full, free and relatively perfect, for however individuals may differ in body and soul as to particular qualities, the common basis between them is such as to afford scope for the exercise of all the physical and psychical affections of one person for another. When the common basis between them is impaired by the death of one or the other, neither the corpse nor the disembodied soul can continue to satisfy the demands of the devotion of the living one; just as neither the corpse nor the disembodied soul could ever have called such devotion into activity. Devotion to the loved one is now only a devotion to the image retained in the memory. The present separation cannot be reconciled with the oneness of the past, for the basis of the oneness between man and man is not in the body, nor in the soul, as such, but in the union of both.

God is a Spirit, and as such the merely psychical man cannot be devoted to Him, and cannot even know Him. The psychical man is indeed the creation and the image of God, and in one sense also His offspring, but is not truly one with Him because there is no common essential basis between the created Psyche and the uncreated Pneuma. The psychical man standing between the lower creation and God, is fully one with neither, and yet a promise and a prophecy all the while of something higher and better to come. His position is meaningless as a finality. So also the animal creation pointed to something higher than itself as its true meaning in the sphere of life. With all the possibilities of the human soul the chasm between it and the eternal Godhead is too great for man to comprehend Him, to come into close communion with Him, or to consecrate himself to Him. He may indeed by contemplating himself and the creation around him know that there is a God, for "that which may be known of God is manifest in them even his eternal power and Godhead;" but man cannot by searching find Him

out, nor by wisdom know Him. There was no common basis on which the infinite God and finite man could hold full communion together, even independent of sin, and hence man in all ages of the world constantly attempted to establish such a basis either by the personification of the wisdom, goodness and power of God in the natural creation, or by the apotheosis of sages and heroes. In both cases there was an unconscious effort to bring into harmony on a common basis the superhuman and the human, the infinite and the finite. Even where there was a belief in original deities, the fathers of the gods, like *Il* of the Chaldeans, or *Uranus* of the Greeks, these gods had to give way in honor and adoration to those who were less august, but came nearer to the basis of the human as the personifications of the particular objects and forces in nature. Even the Jews, with all their training, found in their Jehovah a God mighty and terrible, from whom they were prone to shrink and to take refuge in the worship of the more human-like gods of the nations. The law of that Jehovah was a burden they could not bear, for instead of establishing a common basis, and thus making peace, each additional revelation of His will only made more manifest the greatness of His holiness and the depth of the sins of His people, until the heart in anguish cried out: "Oh that Thou wouldest rend the heavens, that Thou wouldest come down." Every hope of reconciliation was centered in the coming Seed, the anointed of the Lord.

"When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." What a marvellous change is expressed by this language! What a reconciliation between those who seemed so far apart, and what a oneness between those who were so different! This reconciliation and oneness have their basis, of course, in Christ, the incarnate Son of God. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." This was not only evidence that God and man

could become one, but was also one of the constituents of that oneness. The divine and human becoming one in the person of Christ, did not, however, in itself make other individuals one with God. The Son of God appearing in the likeness of sinful flesh was a mystery to man. Flesh and blood could not recognize Him, and the merely psychical man could not understand the spiritual and heavenly things which He spake. Christ being one with the Father as well as with humanity, did the works of the Father, and spake the things of the Father in human form and human speech. The disciples, together with the others who saw and heard Him, having only the basis of the human could properly interpret neither His works nor His doctrine. The other constituent of man's oneness with God was still wanting. As "no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man that is in him, even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." And until the work of redemption was completed in the death and resurrection of Christ, and the true meaning of the incarnation of the Son of God was made manifest in His exaltation above all angels, and in the mystery of Pentecost, His disciples could only helplessly tarry in Jerusalem and wait for the promised coming of the Holy Ghost. By His coming into man the oneness between God and man was fully actualized. In the Incarnation God was made man; in the gift of the Holy Ghost man was made partaker of the divine nature. Henceforth the disciple of Christ is not simply a learner, on the psychical basis, of the things taught him by the Saviour; but by the indwelling Spirit he has become *pneumatikos*, and, as such, he can now discern that which was unknowable to him on the lower basis. In the possession of the Spirit of Christ he is far more really one with the now invisible Christ than he was when he had daily personal intercourse with Him in the flesh. The *Pneuma* in him ennobles the *psyche* and *sarx*, just as the incoming of the *psyche* ennobled the *sarx* in the first creation. He is a new being now, not by creation, but by birth; having still the same personality, indeed, but that personality no longer centred in the old nature of the

dead Adam, but in the new divine-human which is -forever present in the glorified God-man, the Head of the new race. And such oneness with Christ is the first essential condition upon which alone there can be personal consecration to Him. Here only have we the basis of a new heavenly *gnosis*: "I know mine own, and mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father." Here alone have we the basis of a new heaven-born *agápe*: "As the Father hath loved Me, I also have loved you; abide ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love." And here also we have the only basis for our participation in the newly-revealed divine *zoé*: "And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son." And this new *gnosis*, *agápe* and *zoé* demand from us altogether a new *bios*, or living in the world, a living in Christ and for Christ.

When we come to consider the practical bearing of all this upon the question before us, we cannot help but realize that the constant consciousness of our oneness with Christ is that without which any professed consecration to Him is vain. Here, at least, theory dare not be one thing and practice another, and there must be no divorce between what ought to be and what is. If the Saviour Himself could say: "I can of mine own self do nothing," how much more truly does He also say of us: "Without Me ye can do nothing"! If Christ in us be the Rock on which the Church is reared, the consciousness of this fact can alone give us that source of strength without which we are but weaklings. "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me," must still be the constant thought of every earnest Christian. Peter and John standing before the rulers and elders of the Jews at Jerusalem, though appearing to them unlettered and ignorant men, were bold as kings with the consciousness that they were exercising supreme authority and power in making known unto them the great Corner-Stone so recently rejected by these foolish builders.

And it is significantly added that they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus, who ever taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes. The fact is not to be lost sight of here that these same apostles, when they could see Jesus of Nazareth only as a teacher from without, and be loyal to Him merely on the basis of the psychical, but a short time before manifested a cowardly fear for their own safety, when they saw the Master in the power of these same rulers. But how every sarcic and psychic consideration is now suppressed by the overmastering power of the spiritual forces within them, and how God-like they appear in the consciousness that, through the indwelling Spirit, they are one with the glorified God-man! How overwhelming is the heaven-born conviction that they are speaking to men in God's stead!


This consciousness must also always carry with it the same forceful sense of power, for Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. And if those who undertake to teach in His name do not speak as the oracles of God, it is evidence that there is wanting in them the principal condition of consecration to Christ. And whatever be the calling in life of any true Christian, he must necessarily carry with him in all his words and works a power and authority that spring from a source far higher than that which is simply human. A weak Christian is a sick Christian. This consciousness of oneness with Christ is the only basis also on which the martyr-spirit can firmly rest. For he alone in whom Christ is can show the faithfulness which is Christ-like, whether before the praise or condemnation of men. Fealty to Christ on any lower basis than this is always sure to break down in seasons of persecution, or under strong temptation of any kind. To be able to see victory on the cross, triumph at the stake, and gain in death, are conceptions not born of flesh and blood.

It were strange, however, if, in this age, in which the god of material and physical forces is so generally worshipped by the world, the Church should abstain entirely from paying homage at his shrines. That "the race is not to the swift, nor the battle

to the strong," is a truth we all accept; Napoleon's dictum that "God is on the side of the strong battalions," is an error we all reject; and yet in practice it is not the world alone that is influenced by this Napoleonic faith. "Money speaks," "Numbers count," and "Nothing succeeds like success," are the coined expressions deemed of great value in our day, and which too often pass as current shekels in the Temple of God. Is it not becoming almost the rule rather than the exception, even in the Church, that the man of wealth is told, "Sit thou here in a good place," and to the man poor in purse and clothing, "Stand thou there"? That the worth of a man's opinion is estimated by the number of his adherents, and that merely outward success makes amends for the questionable and often vicious methods employed in obtaining it? Judged by such standards our Saviour's own mission in the world was without strength and with insignificant results. But in no sayings of His is His sublime character more clearly shown than when He, who as the Son of Man did not shun human sympathy, and at times even craved it, in the shadow of His agony in the Garden, of His betrayal by Judas, and of His desertion by the eleven, uttered with unfathomable pathos, yet with divine repose, the words: "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone; and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." Such a consciousness ministers a strength and consolation which legions of angels and myriads of men cannot give, and which neither the treachery nor the hostility of men can weaken. Only when the murmurless Lamb of God tasted the ultimate bitterness of death, which is conscious separation from God, was the cry as almost of despair wrung from His soul, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" "If God be for us, who can be against us?" And whether it be the intrepid Elijah on Mt. Carmel, Athanasius against the world, or some lone man of God to-day, who realizes this, there are no hostile powers, human or angelic, that can rob him of his conscious superiority.

But not only does our strength depend upon our oneness with

God, but our efficiency as well. Here the Church of our day is also largely influenced by the methods which are found efficient in merely human interests. Individuals as individuals are seen to be comparatively inefficient even in their greatest activities. Hence the combination of individuals in every direction for the promotion of their own interests. Men of wealth combine their capital, not so much for the public good, as for the protection and increase of their own possessions. The nearer they can come to a monopoly of their particular enterprise, the more efficacious becomes the combination. The same is true of labor unions, trade unions, etc. The more extensive the combination the more effective it becomes for the individuals; and such effective force does not rest so much in the moral quality of the individuals, as in their numerical strength. It is not strange that those members of the Church of Christ who desire to see immediate and tangible results in their activity should copy these methods of the world. And hence we have associations many and methods many for the promotion of greater efficiency in Christian work in the world, and for greater consecration to Christ. But such supposed means for greater efficiency, whether in the world or the Church, rest upon a false conception. In union there is indeed strength, but whether that strength be effective for good or evil depends upon the nature of the union. True union, both in humanity and Christianity, is not grounded primarily in the relation of the individuals to each other, just as the union between the branches of a tree is not grounded in their relation to each other; for that relation itself is determined by the one organic life of the tree in which the true union rests. To tie some of the branches of a tree together into a bundle and call that a union, is not only to do violence to their true union, but to make the branches themselves less effective by such mechanical combination. So also the labor unions, trade unions, etc., cannot, in the end, be effectual in the direction of their own best interests, much less those of the nation or humanity, because they ignore the true union in both. That is always a selfish, and even suicidal principle



at bottom which first divorces the general from the particular good, and then identifies the particular good with individual self-interest.

This same truth holds in the sphere of Christianity. The only union that can be effective here is union with Christ, as it is also the true ground of personal consecration to Christ, as we have seen. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body." And this oneness with Christ through the Spirit, and, as such, our oneness with each other, is the only true basis on which there can be any effective Christian activity. The powers which constituted the Holy Catholic Church in the days of the apostles were then, and have been ever since, the only efficient means by which that Church has been extended among men. The Church is a spiritual organization. The external and visible things of this organization are indeed necessary, but are to be regarded only as the means through which the heavenly forces back of them are effective. It is not the language form of the word that is effective, but the spirit and life back of it. So it is also not the outward association of Christians that makes them or their work effective. The genuine inspiration of the Christian assembly does not come from the fact of the association of a certain class of individual Christians, nor yet from the fact that we stand together in the assembly of Rome, Heidelberg, or Westminster, but in the fact that we "are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, . . . to the general assembly and church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven." And he who is always conscious of his oneness with the Holy Catholic Church is vastly more effective in his Christian activity than is he whose denominational or associational consciousness predominates over that. It is far wiser to turn our activity toward a realization of the true union that is, than towards that which is but a simulation of the true; and in order to realize this union it is infinitely better to have full faith in what Christ has done for us, and what He is in us, than what we can do for Him. The one is the faith of Simon, son of Jonas, the other that of Peter,

the apostle of our Lord. If denominationalism has marred the true union of the Church, the healing surely cannot be effected by any such *similia similibus* remedies as are at hand in our modern associations, whether denominational, interdenominational or undenominational.

The other prerequisite condition of personal consecration to Christ is the consciousness of our difference from Him. Here also the difference between the Father and the Son during the state of humiliation of the Son, enables us to understand how the difference between Christ and the Christian constitutes a condition of such consecration. In every respect in which our Saviour could say, "My Father is greater than I," we find the measure of the condition in which He could consecrate Himself to the Father. His oneness with the Father constituted the internal, and His difference from Him the external condition of such consecration. "He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death." In this comprehensive statement we have a true delineation of our Saviour's life on earth. His self-limitation carried with it such a difference between Him and the Father as did not exist in the world of glory from which He descended into this world. The "form," "likeness," and "fashion," were not merely external appearances, but they are the expression of a real, internal, personal *status*, by which alone His obedience to the will of the Father could have any such moral value as to merit the exaltation which follows: "Wherefore God also highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name." We can conceive the *kenosis* to have been a single act, but the obedience, to be real, must have been accomplished, during the whole period of His humiliation, under the constant consciousness not simply of the possibility, but of the temptation not to obey the will of the Father. For He was in all points tempted like as we are, and these temptations were as real as ours. His night-long prayers were real wrestlings with the Father, because of His conscious

need of His continual help; and His full personal consecration **to** Him was the result of a constant struggle to realize the **Perfect** life demanded by His relation to the Father.

The same truth holds between Christ and the Christian. If **the** consciousness of our oneness with Him makes us stronger **than** kings, the consciousness of our difference from Him and **inferiority** to Him makes us, or ought to make us, the humblest **and** meekest beings on earth. Neither does this difference **involve** any contradiction to our oneness with Him, for such **difference** is not outside of Him, but in Him. He is the Head, we **are** the members; He is the Master, we the disciples; He is **the** Lord, we the servants; but all this on the basis of one **common** life. The fact that the Father was in the Son established **in** the God-man such an ideal for His living on earth that the **constant** consciousness of that ideal made Him the meek and **lowly** Being that He was. Even He did not measure Himself **by** Himself, much less by the measure of men. So Christ in **us** is the ideal standard for our living in the world. The more **we** know of Christ, and the greater the consciousness of our oneness with Him is, the deeper also will be the consciousness of our shortcomings and imperfections; the greater the knowledge of our want of conformity to the image within us, and the stronger the desire to reach after such conformity. If the **weak** Christian is a sick Christian, the self-sufficient Christian is a dying Christian. Here is the basis of the Pauline paradox, which to the psychical man must ever be foolishness: "When I **am** weak then I am strong."

But in our difference from Christ lies the possibility and danger of our going astray. In our want of perfect apprehension lies the danger of misapprehension, and in our incapability of perfect obedience lies the danger of disobedience. In order to personal consecration to Christ it is demanded that every endowment and acquirement of spirit, soul and body be brought into subjection to Him, and that in all our growing "we grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head." Necessity is laid upon us ever to strive to reach the ideal: "Be ye there-

fore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Woe be to us if we forget this standard, and measure ourselves by ourselves. The inspiration to such a living cannot come from numbers, not from any merely psychical forces whatever, nor yet from any subjectively worked-up enthusiasm. The calm conscious power flowing from our oneness with Christ, and the strong impulses resulting from an ever present Spirit-wrought desire to be more and more Christ-like in all our doings, cannot fail to carry with them a constantly growing consecration to Christ, and our living, short as it may come of the true ideal, shall not be in vain.

The great danger in our day is that the consciousness of our oneness with, and therefore also of our difference from, Christ does not keep pace with the supposed increase in our apprehension of the revelation of Christ. The so-called advanced theology is not afflicted with modesty. We feel strong where we should feel weak; for our strength is in Christ, and not in our apprehension of His revelation, even though such apprehension be true. That assumed wisdom and philosophy which "puff up" are, however, to be discredited. If they are not wise who believe that wisdom and virtue perished with the ancients, and that we in our day have inherited only their ignorance and vices, they certainly are not sages who believe that we have added a hundredfold to their wisdom and virtue, and have inherited none of their ignorance and but few of their vices. The optimism in the one case is worse than the pessimism in the other; for the knowledge of one's shortcomings furnishes at least an essential condition for improvement, while the absence of it excludes it. If Paul was taught that his thorn in the flesh was needful for him lest he should be exalted overmuch, because of the exceeding greatness of the revelations vouchsafed to him in the glorious light of the third heaven, there should be at least the shadow of suspicion upon those who glory in the rush-light illumination of their own *Vorstellungen* rather than in the weakness in which the strength of Christ is made perfect.

There is yet another direction in which our subject, it may

be thought, should demand consideration—in that of our consecration to Christ in the persons of our fellow-Christians, and in our devotion to His will with reference to them that are without. But it is hardly necessary to remark that this is included in what has already been said. If our consecration to Christ in our twofold relation to Him be sincere, there can be no further question concerning our faithfulness in other directions; for he who is true to God cannot be faithless to men, whether they are within or without the Church. The consecration of the Son to the Father made Him what He was to men, and the consecration by the Apostles to Christ made them what they were to men. And this is true still, although there are not a few in our day who reverse this order, by making outward zeal and activity the measure of consecration to Christ. The insistence upon outward uniformity of service betrays not only a narrow, but a false conception of true consecration to Christ. The tree is indeed known by its fruit, but it is not required that that fruit should always be peaches. It is quality, not uniformity in kind, that is wanted. Gifts differ, but the basis of the stewardship is the same, and it is required that each steward be faithful to Christ whatever the entrusted talents may be. One minister may have unbounded faith in the power of Christ in Him, and in the efficacy of His Word and Sacraments, and at the same time be humble, retiring and unselfish, not seeking to please men, but to be more and more true to the perfect ideal within him. Another may have implicit confidence in himself, seeking the praise of men, coveting the high places, striking hands with all kinds of men in his pursuit of self-sought honor, and having more faith in the rhetoric of his sermons than in the divine power of the Word. He may be like a comet that may attract for a season the gaze and admiration of men; the first, however, is like some polar star, whose modest but steady shining will point the way and cheer the heart of many a weary pilgrim in the desert world, and bring to his true reckonings again many a wayward, storm-tossed wanderer on the ocean of time.

Silver Run, Md., August 29, 1891.

VI.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.*

BY REV. FRANKLIN K. LEVAN, D.D.

By the favor of the committee having the arrangement of the program of the Spiritual Conference in charge, the subject of *Sunday Observance* has been assigned to me. The theme is a broad one, and it admits of discussion from several points of view. Which of them was in the mind of the committee as the one that should be made controlling in the discussion to-day I cannot tell; controlling in the sense that it should be mainly or principally considered, inasmuch as to view the subject in all its bearings would make of this paper an extended essay. It was not meant, nor do I intend, that it should be such. I propose to be brief, and to confine myself to general principles and facts.

I. Sunday observance may be considered *historically*. It is a vast subject looked at in this light. To do it justice would require that we call up the long line of ages during which it has obtained, and the various races and nations which have acknowledged its claims and yielded practical obedience, more or less complete, to its command. To show how Sunday has been observed, to show this even in outline sketch, would be the unfolding of a chequered history, intensely interesting from first to last. What not that is dear, that is high, that is beautiful and good in the life, the progress, the aspirations and hopes of men, would we behold bound up with it? The figure is probably not overdrawn when we say that, as the roseate

* A paper read August 4th, 1891, at Lancaster, Pa., before the Association of Reformed Ministers and Elders for Spiritual Conference.

morning stands out over against the gloom and the darkness of the receding night, much so the people who have a Sunday as a Sabbath and keep it as the Lord's Day stand out over against the rest of the world who either know it not, or, knowing it, fail to conform their life and institutions to it.

II. In the second place our subject might be considered in the light of the direct and the indirect Scriptural injunctions relating to it. The Scriptures abound in matter of this kind, and it is given a prominent position throughout, both as to statement and reference. We have the commandment with respect to the Sabbath, for it is there practically already a commandment, as part of the account of the creation; we have the unquestionable direct commandment as one of the ten words of the Mosaic law given on Mount Sinai. Then come the institutions and regulations under the Old Covenant; some of them temporary and limited as to the people; some of them, however, of lasting obligation and of application to all people, because they are men. It is to be noted, too, that these Sabbatical injunctions, with all their bearings, are not abstract nor arbitrary; for the very first appearance thereof stands in concrete connection with the successive acts of the creation, and the repetition thereof, in the various forms, stands in like concrete connection with the life of a people running through many centuries.

In the New Testament we have the practical interpretation put upon these same Sabbatical laws by the Founder of Christianity. We have a number of statements as to how Jesus Christ Himself observed the Sabbath, and of many things which He said respecting it. Then we have the institution of the *new* Sabbath, though *not* a second one, in connection with the new creation and the new covenant,—*the Lord's Day*,—and the obligations which were attached to it in this form. There is room for a volume of interesting discussion in the line here indicated.

If we make a distinction, as we ought, between the manner in which, on the one hand, the Sabbath, or our Lord's Day, has

been kept historically considered, and the conceptions, on the other hand, which have prevailed, or which now prevail, as to how the day ought to be kept, a consideration of the latter would find its place under this second head. And as all things cannot be done at once, the main purpose might be answered by looking at the conceptions which at present are really so held in the Christian Church as to influence men in their conduct. The Christian Sunday is an institution of modern society as well as a holy day of the Church. The majority of people, probably, form their opinions of it, and give it such observance as we find current, because of its institutional character, and according to it, full as much as because of what the Scriptures teach concerning it. We have here a mixed or double source of authority for the popular mind, unavoidably so, and it is in this way that we come to have so many varying conceptions as to what constitutes proper, or, to use a current term, *sufficient* Sunday observance.

Allow us to name a few of the leading conceptions, which, however, with many persons, run more or less into each other.

a.) There is the strict Sabbatarian view, which seeks to transfer the Levitical Sabbath as to the manner of keeping it to Anno Domini 1891.

b.) There is the view which holds that it is the Lord's day, and that the whole of it is the Lord's day, and as such it combines rest, worship and the service of charity.

c.) There is the European Protestant view, more strict in Reformed sections, less strict in Lutheran sections, which admits of limited work, business and pleasure in the afternoon of the day.

d.) There is the view common in Roman and Greek Catholic countries, which attaches scarcely any special sacredness to the day as such, but places the sacredness in the religious services altogether, which are assigned to the day; and so it ceases to be a holy-day and degenerates into a holiday.

e.) Other views there are still, very miscellaneous in character, but not calling for detailed mention here; for the four which we

have specified are the principal ones, and comprehend within their outlines the convictions of probably nine-tenths of the population of the nominally Christian world.

III. We come now, in the third place, to consider our subject in yet another form. We ask the questions: Why is there any Sunday observance at all? What are the bottom reasons for it? What do these reasons require of us? and by what authority do they address us?

In answer to the question, *Why is there any Sunday observance at all?* and the other, which is of like nature, *What are the bottom reasons for it?* we reply that both find their answers in the positive Divine Revelation to man on the subject; and in that Revelation the reasons for the institution of the Sabbath day and the manner of observing it are represented as lying in the very constitution of man, in his relation to the natural order of the world, on the one hand, and in his relation to the Almighty Creator and Father, in whose image and similitude he has been made, on the other.

In Genesis, second chapter, second and third verses, we have the first account having reference to this particular day and its special character. There we read, "And on the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

According to this statement the Sabbath day begins with God; not, first, in the sense that He gave a commandment with respect to it, but in the sense that it *came by and into the order of His own being and activity*, and that by His own will. *This is to be noted as being here given as the causing cause* for the existence of the day for us men. Having finished the general work of the creation, God "rested," in the sense in which He can "rest." THAT is for Himself and of Himself; and then, looking forward to man, who should bear His own image and likeness, He blessed and sanctified the day for him. For this rest of God, this state in the being of God which the word "rest" is here

used approximately to express, is also eventually to become the condition of man, in so far as he carries within himself the image and similitude of God. The "rest" of God is here represented as *following* that side of His activity which stands out in the creation of the natural, material universe; and the strictly corresponding rest for man *follows* after the individual has wrought out his connections with and relations to this same natural material order, and passed over into that sphere of which Holy Writ, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, saith, "There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God," in very probable allusion to the primitive passage which we are considering. But man cannot pass through this present world and life, and enter into the divine state of rest without self-conscious and self-determined preparation. God, who foresaw the entanglements in which man stands here, and the difficulties with which he is surrounded, God All-merciful adumbrated that heavenly rest; more than that, He took as it were of that heavenly rest and interjected it into time, by separating, blessing and sanctifying every seventh day in the revolution of the earth in which He placed man; *this* He did that it might be to man, if he will, a means, an anticipation, an approximation, a foretaste, of his eternal rest. In this terse picture, drawn by the inspired penman in Genesis, we have the fundamental *why*, and the *bottom reason* for what we now call *Sunday Observance*.

We now pass on to a consideration of the fourth commandment. It is not right, nor does it give us a full view of the subject, if we begin with this, as the habit of many persons is. The fourth commandment is a resultant, and amplification on the human side, of what the description in Gen. 2: 2, 3 sets forth, and cannot well be considered in advance of that, much less without regard to that.

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is

within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

You will notice that the description given in the first chapter of Genesis, and in the first three verses of the second chapter, pervades all over the thought and wording of this fourth commandment. But leaving that out of special view for the moment, let us look somewhat closely at this commandment. It has the definite injunction: "*Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.*" The day is assumed to be holy, for we are told, at the close, that God Himself has "blessed" it and "hallowed" it. Man shall allow it now to be such for himself, and he shall keep it after such manner, that is, in a holy way; and further, he is forbidden the doing or the permitting to be done, of certain things which would interfere with the realization of the object on the part of man for which the day was originally instituted. The commandment is plain, distinct in language, and comprehensive in meaning.

Let us now ask, *With what authority does the fourth commandment address us?* In one sense we have answered that already in the exposition of that passage in Genesis which has reference to the original institution of the Sabbath, inasmuch as this commandment is directly based upon the facts there related. Nevertheless the question is still proper and important in another sense. Practically there will be (and always has been) Sunday observance, in character and extent, according to the authority which is felt to lie in this fourth commandment. What is that authority?

1.) We find this commandment in the Word of God. It stands there as one among many, with nothing to indicate inferior merit on its part over against the rest. It confronts us as part of the Divine Word, and, as such, with the authority which belongs to that Word, generally speaking.

2.) It is one of the Ten Commandments, distinctively so called, and on the same level as to force with the other nine.

It is one of the *ten sacred words*, with which no table of laws in the history of man has ever been able to stand comparison. From the first even until now they have stood by themselves, a single ten, unapproached and unapproachable, like the mountain from which they were given at the time of their bestowal.

3.) Of all the ten commandments it can be said, that they lie in the order of things. There is nothing arbitrary about them. If they had never been given to Moses, if man had never come to a clear knowledge of them, they, one and all, would have been commandments still in the sense of laws, and nothing less. "Honor thy father and thy mother" lies in the eternal relation that must exist between parent and child. "Thou shalt not kill" is the cry of human nature over against the individual who lifts up a murderous hand. So each in its way with the commands, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness," "Thou shalt not covet." Just so with the first, second and third commandments. And the fourth one forms no exception to the one absolute rule. That God revealed to men these His laws—*laws*, mark you—was an act of mercy, of Fatherly love to them in their ignorance. Revelation makes the law plainly known and gives it the form of a commandment.

In this light then we must view the fourth commandment and, too, the keeping of it; with this kind of authority, which is a Divine authority in its most comprehensive form, it confronts us. That command is of perpetual force.

We are now ready to consider our Lord's Day, the Christian Sunday. And, first, as to the change from the seventh to the first day of the week.

The historic record of this change, with the implied cause for it, we find in St. John 20: 19, where we read: "The same day at evening, being the *first* day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." And in the twenty-sixth verse of the same chapter we read: "And after eight days again his disci-

ples were within, . . . then came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." It was also on the day of Pentecost, fifty days from Easter, and thus the first day of the week, that the disciples of Jesus were assembled for worship, that the gift of the Holy Ghost came, and the infant Christian Church was founded, and three thousand souls were added to the original number of disciples.

We need not specially to repeat here how all these things grew out of the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and continue to stand in most intimate connection with it. That resurrection life took up into itself, as the higher always takes up into itself that which is lower, the old Sabbath day with all its significance and obligations, *and glorified it*, even as the human body of the risen Lord had been glorified; and that, *per necessity*, carried with it the change from the seventh day of the week, the day marking the period of the finished material creation, to the first day of the week, dating the completion of redemption and the entrance into the state of glory of the Son of man, and for men. The disciples of Jesus did not make a change; they simply accepted a change, which the new conditions, resulting from Christ's redeeming work, had wrought.

In the other and more essential respects, what effect had the resurrection of Jesus Christ upon the ancient Sabbath? That is a most practical question, and it has much to do with our subject of *Sunday Observance*.

The Apostle Paul tells us that our Lord, the same night in which He was betrayed, when He took the cup and gave it to His disciples, said: "This cup is the *New Testament in my blood*." A New Testament, then; a New Covenant; in reality and in truth. Not an inferior one, but a higher, more glorious one. In this New Testament the Christian Sabbath, our Lord's Day, stands, and by its conditions it is of necessity governed, and of its character it of necessity partakes. Coming to particulars, then, our general postulate being accepted as stated, we feel safe in setting forth the following points:

1. The new order of man's spiritual life, brought about by the incarnation and by the resurrection of our Lord, did not abrogate the Sabbath day as we find it originally constituted, and subsequently divinely enjoined. All its essential characteristics remained, but were lifted up, illuminated for man, just as the essence of the Old Covenant remained in the life and the light of the New.

2. What was abrogated were the Jewish non-essential ordinances and traditions. The *legalistic* attributes, resulting from the peculiar historic course run by the people of Israel, were removed, stripped off and done away with, in order to bring into the foreground its original *humanistic* character, as indicated by the Lord Jesus when He said that man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath was made for man.

3. The disciples, as we learn from passages already quoted, and from others which might be added, observed the day of the resurrection, and the corresponding day of the week thenceforward, in meditating and consulting concerning their risen Lord, and concerning the things of the kingdom. Then worship in the form of preaching, prayer, song and the administration of the Eucharist, took its place in connection with the day. So also the bringing of gifts of charity and the doing of works of charity,—a charism strongly brought out at an early stage in the development of the infant Christian Church. All these *observances* of the *Christian Sunday*, and the shutting out and forbidding, among believers, of whatever was in contradiction to them, or out of harmony with them, in thought or practice, were firmly rooted and established during the life-time of the apostles.

4. We notice in all this a *marked change* in the keeping of the day as compared with Jewish habits; a change not to secularism, as the so-called continental Sunday has it, and as there are strong clamorings in our own land for having it; not in the way of making it a day on which wickedness and sin might have free play and run riot; *but*, a day on which the higher spiritual nature of man might come into full recognition in the

soul of each person, going out in the manifold forms of worship, now in humble contrition, then joyfully, exultingly, and reaching to man the hand of charity, affection, peace and brotherly appreciation.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

1.) It has been our object to bring to view the real basis on which our Christian Sunday rests, in order that we might come truly to know its essential character; for upon that must depend all Sunday observance that is intelligent and that has in it power to stay.

2.) Sunday observance stops short in the Christian Church, at the present time, of much that is involved in it, as considered from a practical, possible standpoint. Nor has, at any time, the real in the case come up to the possible ideal. This statement holds especially as to certain countries and sections of countries, and also as to the different parts included in such an observance as the day calls for. And when we come to what is called Christian society in the more general sense, the case, as might be expected, is still worse. The Christian state is behind the Christian Church, and not up with it.

3.) God's ideals, that look to the real, all in the end reach the real. The life of the Church, representing the life of the risen Lord, as it brings all things to their consummation, *steadily works* to the purification of this holy day on the part of Christians from all that is foreign to it, and to the employing of *it, for their good*, with whatsoever is natural and proper to it. The Christian dispensation and Testament, in which we stand, tends by irresistible force to approximate our observance of the Sunday to that observance implied in the Sabbath day of the creation and in the glorified Lord's day of the resurrection of Christ, in so far as they look to our earthly relations. No need of fear on this point.

4.) All progress in better keeping of the sacred day is in the way of reformation in the Church, either as a whole or in parts of it, and society and the state gradually follow after in those

respects which are open to them ; for, let us not forget, that many, and the best things, which enter into Christian Sunday observance are of the kingdom simply in which Christ is Lord, and may not be touched by society or the state as such. What we technically call the Reformation, namely that of the sixteenth century, did wonders in clarifying the vision of Christian people with reference to the Lord's day, as well as with reference to other matters ; and it did equal wonders in establishing a better, truer keeping of it than had been habitual. That Reformation did for this day on a large scale what must continually take place on a smaller scale. It was in and of the Church ; and there we must do our work to the same end. From all this we see also, that much of the effort, current at the present time, to bring about the better observance of Sunday, begins at the wrong place, because the appeal is made to the community and world at large, and this same world, in its own sphere, has little use for the Christian Sunday.

5.) And now, if the position, which we have assumed and illustrated in this paper, with respect to the Christian Sunday, which must also of necessity determine the observance of it, be correct, it would be in place to examine all existing Sunday observances among us in the Church, and pass judgment, favorable or unfavorable, upon them, *according as they stand or fall by this standard*. Then we would also find that observances needed to be added to those which we now have ; for it is evident enough that there are duties, privileges and blessings enshrined in this day and in the keeping of it, which we do not now observe, or observe with slight appreciation. We do not feel called upon to undertake such an examination of existing Sunday observances, in addition to what we have already said. It must suffice to have made the suggestion.

VII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

A TRIED STONE.

"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat."—St. Luke xxii. 31.

SECTION VII.

Peter's Ignorance.

LET us return, now, to Simon Bar-Jona, the first representative Christian, who was to differ from all his fellow-disciples in being tempted of Satan and tried of God at the same time with his Master, and in the same place—the palace of the high priest. The like pressure was to be brought to bear upon him—the terror of the cross. And that pressure was intended to prove whether he would hold fast to the Christ, and also to reveal him to himself.

In his confession Simon had struck on the first, the grand, central and distinguishing truth of the Christian religion—the eternal sonship of its founder. But of the next in order, of the truth that this eternal Son had become incarnate to "take away the sin of the world" by dying for it, he was then unconvinced, or he would not have rebuked their Master when He foretold His violent death. Nor could Peter, at the present time, have denied the Lord had he known Him experimentally as a redeemer. He had been born into the family of Christ an unconscious child, and having known Him only as a friend and brother, he was now to learn to know Him as a saviour and father. But since without knowing himself to be a sinner, no

one can receive Jesus actually as a saviour, Peter, preparatory to this, was to be taught his own natural condition as a lost son of the first Adam.

Simon was willing to sit with docile spirit at the Master's feet, or follow Him over the world in deeds of charity, or, leaving the crowd, abide with Him on the mount of Transfiguration; but he was not willing to hear that He "must suffer many things, and be *killed*." He rebelled at the thought of His dying. It was not His crucifixion that he objected to now. Of that, he had not the remotest idea. Neither at the first, nor the second mention of it, did the Messiah state the particular *mode* of His death. He barely made known the fact, with some of its cruel accompaniments, it is true, but it was against the fact in any shape that Simon remonstrated. A protest against violence and suffering merely, Jesus would not have rebuked so sharply as when He said, "Get thee behind me, Satan." Peter was but the ignorant mouth-piece of the devil when he desired the Lord to shun the death that He alone had then in view. At that stage of his discipleship and new life, he had not realized that Jesus "*must* be killed," nor why, nor in what particular way.

But many more wished Him to abide forever, and Simon's desire gratified would have left Him, as it did them, a Jew in nothing but the name. It is the vicarious death of Christ that distinctly marks the Jewish church. The true Jew believed in this, even when, for lack of greater light and knowledge, he could not reach His highest divinity. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" exclaimed the Baptist. It is also marked distinctively by the confession of His sinless humanity joined with His atoning work. "And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God," added John, by which he meant that Jesus was the Messiah purposely created and consecrated for sacrifice. But this, joined to the other, while it raised him to, did not lift him beyond the highest Jewish faith. It is the Christian faith which is further marked by His divinity, resurrection and the giving of His

life in regeneration; though Peter had not yet gained the knowledge of more than the first of these, and was ignorant of his own participation in the last.

The words of Nathanael at his first meeting with Jesus are sometimes made to infringe on the special privilege of Simon Peter. How could Nathanael, at the very opening of Christ's ministry, have the slightest conception of that deep and profound secret (His Divinity) which was reserved for the future! or how could any of the disciples, at their first meeting with the Messiah, even so much as hint at that which was to be revealed, and they were to learn only gradually! None of them, at that early date, could begin to imagine, much less suggest, the immense truth, which, in the fulness of time, was to be evoked from their lips by the close and authoritative questioning of their Master. Nor could any of them voice, or confess it, before the hour when He should press them to speak. And this hour did not arrive till two years after the calling of the disciples.

Philip, likewise, when he brought Nathanael to Jesus with the words, "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write," had no idea that the Messiah's nature was twofold. And even of His inferior origin, his estimate was very low. For in the same breath with which He pronounced Him to be "He who should come," he called Him "*the Son of Joseph!*" So late as on the eve of His crucifixion Jesus was obliged to say to this disciple—"Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?"

Nathanael's exclamations of surprise, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel!" were not a confession. The first was merely an acknowledgment that Jesus was their true Messiah, and the last, that He was more than "the King of the Jews," namely, the King of those who were Israelites indeed, notwithstanding He had "come out of (wicked) Nazareth." As a confession prompted by the Spirit, they would have been an anti-climax; whereas, "the Holy

Ghost" (an old divine somewhere quaintly and beautifully says) "is the most elegant of all speakers."

Nathanael did not mean by "the Son of God" the same that Simon Bar-Jona meant by "the Son of the *living* God." Whatever advance he may have made afterwards, he was not, at that time, confessing Christ's personality. He was not saying whether He was human, or divine, or both; whether He had one nature, or two. Least of all was He intimating His eternal divinity. Peter's conviction of Christ's higher nature, however, had grown so fast and strong that it threatened to obscure, for him, His lower nature. Of this he failed to see the significance. He could neither recognize the propriety and necessity of their Master's death, nor its vicarious character. When Jesus began to reveal His certain fate, Simon boldly remonstrated against it. But though in so doing he greatly erred and met with a severe rebuke, his name was not struck from the roll of Christians, because the belief in and confession of the Messiah's eternal divinity is the first and most distinguishing feature of their faith. The conviction of his own lost estate, and Christ's salvation, would yet make Peter a Jew of the highest type—that is, "one inwardly."

Though only half-seeing, the Son of Jonas had laid his finger unerringly on the open glory of the Christian religion, and touched the hidden spring of the Jewish. "By the Spirit," he had called the Messiah, "Lord." One part of David's lesson he had learned; but of the other, he knew nothing; and, as in David's case, so in his this part was to be borne to him by a bitter experience. Having ascended to the height of the Messiah's divinity, he was now to descend to the depth of His humanity, and learn that Christ was more than a partaker of man's sinless nature—even that He had *assumed* or taken on Himself as if it was His own, his sinful nature! He had learned the answer to the great question—"What think ye of Christ, Whose Son is he?"—put by Jesus (afterward in the temple and on the eve of His death) to the scribes

and Pharisees, and which they found so unanswerable. But he was now to learn its sequel. Only thus could Simon become such a Christian as the Master had promised he should be—one able to teach by precept and example, worthy to open “the kingdom of heaven,” and in the temple built without hands be a sure foundation-stone. It might do for others to grope in darkness ; or to speak, like the scribes, as those having no authority. It might do for thousands to remain (as St. Paul complains) all their lives long “babes in Christ,” but it would not do for St. Peter. He was to be in the Christian church what John the Baptist was in the Jewish, “a burning and a shining light.” He was to lead the van of the Lord’s hosts, and the trumpet they were to follow dare give no uncertain sound.

“While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? *Whose Son is he?*” “They say unto him, The Son of David.” The answer to that question was easy, and Simon Peter had virtually made it when he said to Jesus, “Thou art the Christ,” for all men knew that the Messiah was to come in the line of David. But Peter’s reply included more than the reply of the Pharisees. He believed what they did not, and would not—that the Christ was sinless. Hence his answer contained the element of a grand truth which that of the Pharisees wholly lacked. It was the truth that Jesus was the Son of what would have been David’s real, or true life, had Adam never sinned. Having been “conceived by the Holy Ghost,” He had been born of *that* life, and thus was what no other scion of David could be. He was *the*, or the *only* Son of David. The Scriptures do not stop till they make His “great original,” “Adam,” *before* he sinned. The original of all other men is Adam *after* he sinned. How easily, then (when the time came for the Old Testament saints to be actually regenerated) could David’s sinless human “offspring,” become David’s sinless human “root!”

The further question of the Christ’s Divinity, Jesus did not

here argue with the Pharisees. He quietly assumed that since "David himself in, or by the Holy Spirit,* calleth him Lord, saying, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool," † He *must* be Divine. But out of that assumption grew another question for the Pharisees to answer. And that was—"How," or "Whence," or *by whose agency* did He, who was already in existence before David, and even "before Abraham," become, in their day, David's mortal, human Son? "If David then calleth him (the Christ) Lord, How, or Whence, is he his Son?"

"And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.'"

They were now to suffer the legitimate result of their rejection of the Holy Ghost; for *He* was the "How" and the "Whence," of the incarnation. He was the agent of the human and the divine in the Messiah! He was the author of the indissoluble union of David's "Lord" and David's Son!

But these were only leading questions, intended to open the way for others, had the scribes and Pharisees been willing to follow. Besides, to answer them correctly, required a knowledge that scribes and Pharisees, and even Peter, had never attained to. However, Simon was to reach it now; and once knowing, he would accept and preach it, with all it involved, to the end of his days.

"How" is the Christ at the same time David's "Lord" and "Son," would have been followed by the questions, *Why* is He both of these in one? and Why should the "Lord" become a partaker of man's mortal flesh, put on the appearance or "likeness of sinful flesh," lead a life of suffering, and endure a painful and violent death?

"Why?" Because He was man's father by creation, and man had sinned and cut himself off from his maker and father; and the incarnation and all the acts of the life of the one, two-

* St. Matt. xxii. 41-46. St. Mark xii. 35-37. St. Luke xx. 41-44. R. V. *Ibid.*

† Psalm cx. 1.

fold Christ, together with His descent again, in spirit, and by the Spirit, was the sole method by which the two—God and man—could be brought together again. Of his lost estate by nature, Peter had never been convinced. This was his ignorance. But he was to be taught now ; it, and its remedy. And the only way he could learn it was by being given to “Satan,” to be “sifted as wheat.”

SECTION VIII.

Satan.

In considering St. Peter's trial, it should be approached with a reverence similar to that with which the Master's is studied. Simon's was not a premeditated sin, like David's. Nor was it the outcome of a long course of evil practice, like the sin of Judas. It was the result of a sudden and violent assault from the great enemy of souls, and ordained by God. When “Jesus was led up into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil,” He was “led up of the Spirit.” When Job was given over to Satan, he was given by God. God initiated his temptation and trial by asking Satan, “Hast thou considered my servant Job?” As Christ at His crucifixion was made to endure the attacks of the adversary, so Peter was now to be alike tempted and tried. And this was as much for the Master's satisfaction, as for his own enlightenment. If it was necessary that the perfect corner-stone of the Jewish church should be thoroughly tried before it was laid as the foundation of the Christian, how much greater was the need that its brilliant neighbor should be tested. It shone, and yet it might not be sound. If it was important that the Master be proved, why not the disciple? Hence the first declaration, “Thou shalt be called Cephas,” and the second, “Thou art Peter,” was followed by the third, “Behold, he is in thy hand ; *but save his life.*”

That Satan should desire to lay his hand on the disciples,

was only natural. It accorded with his character as the enemy of the Messiah, to hate His people. Of all Christ's foes, Satan was the oldest and bitterest. He had enticed the parents of the race from their allegiance to Him, and heard the promise that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and of the multitudes who watched for His coming, none waited with the anxiety that Satan did. It was he who incited Herod to slaughter the babes of Bethlehem in hope of crushing the Herculean infant; and he dogged the footsteps of Jesus of Nazareth, now as friend and now as foe, from the cradle to the grave. Him, he found invincible, but not so His disciples, especially the foremost of them. His importance Satan knew well. It being his habit to lurk among the sons of God, he had heard Peter's wonderful confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and marked the instant response of Jesus, "And thou art Peter; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and from that hour, in Satan's resolve, Simon Bar-Jona was a doomed man. A second Son of God, who was to carry the keys, and open that kingdom of heaven destined to supersede and finally overthrow his own, was a worthy prize, second only to the Messiah Himself!

However, he could not touch him without the consent of Him who had many times proved Himself his Master, and therefore he boldly asked him of the Lord. He begged for Peter, as of old he had begged for Job! And the Lord granted his request! He yielded His first-born son into the hands of Satan to be sifted as wheat! And why not? Had not the Messiah, at His baptism, stood sponsor for Simon's repentance as well as faith? And, having believed because he had been taught to know the Christ, how could Peter repent unless he were also taught to know himself—taught, not by being made to sin, but by God's hiding His face from him while Satan tempted him to sin? After having revealed to Simon the glory of the Messiah, the Holy Spirit was pledged to show him the secret evil of his own heart. Only thus

could those great acts of Christ—His suffering and dying—to which Peter had so strongly objected, be made plain to him. The time had come for Jesus to answer his rash prayer and, for a little while, “depart from him.”

Three times Christ had emphasized the name of Peter, and three times Satan had determined that Peter should deny the Christ and himself, and by this accomplish his own ruin. He had succeeded in removing the Baptist, that crying “Voice” which proclaimed the Messiah and His work so far and wide. What was to hinder him from silencing this too-ready tongue—nay, more—to make it the instrument of its own destruction? Satan saw no great obstacle in the way, for though the Master might be invincible, the servants were not (as Judas was showing) and therefore, His consent obtained, he joyfully laid his plan.

True, what was to hinder him from destroying this new, created life, even as in the beginning he destroyed the first? It was not less mortal than it, and of this, and that Christ was his Father, Peter was ignorant as a babe.

When the Shepherd of the flock should be smitten (Satan reasoned) and His sheep, in their flight, rush hither and thither, tumultuously away, the feet of Simon could easily be caught in the snare that he would lay for him. If the great Jewish church itself was destined to tremble and totter, and its noble “Head of the corner” to fall with the shock of an earthquake, why should not its first neighboring stone be detached, the succeeding ones scattered, and the twelfth and last, the unsoundest of all, be broken to pieces? Or, O joy! might not the sheep which he would torment the most, leap under his goadings, and rush, like the other, to its wilful death? Plotting thus, Satan gladly and widely spread his snare; but ever, as he encircled closer and closer his unwary prey, the Messiah watched with vigilant eye.

SECTION IX.

Christ's Warnings.

"Simon, Simon," the Master warned him as the hour of trial approached, "behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." All the disciples were to be put to the test, but Simon's trial was to be, by far, the severest—"But I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not." And then, jealous for his honor as the eldest and the leader, his faithful promiser immediately added: "and when thou art converted" (or completely turned to me again) "strengthen thy brethren."

"Lord," rejoined Peter, "I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death." But with the feeling that this going was something secret and mysterious, he asked, "*Whither* goest thou, Lord?" "*Whither* I go, thou canst not follow me now," Jesus answered; "but thou shalt follow me afterwards." To this, Peter, with that childlike persistence so natural to him, continued—"Why cannot I follow thee now?" And then, growing more earnest, he solemnly averred—"I will lay down my life for thy sake." "Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake?" responded Jesus, gazing mournfully at his unconscious fellow-sufferer, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice."

"All ye shall be offended because of me this night," He again told them. But Simon, innocent of any meditated guilt, and strongly confident in his absorbing love for the Master, volunteered to say, "Although all shall be offended, yet will not I. If I should *die with thee*, I will not deny thee in any wise." "Likewise also said all the disciples." "I tell *thee, Peter*," rejoined the Lord, "the cock shall not crow this day till thou hast thrice denied that thou knowest me." And then He ceased to caution him; for Peter, like the others, could not, and would not believe

that there was any evil in himself till he had actually seen it.

How marvelous his disregard of Christ's earnest warnings! How totally he had forgotten the petition He had taught them, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one,"* and the express command, "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation!" How astonishing his apathy when Jesus, seeking the sympathy of His disciples in Gethsemane, appealed to him by name—"Simon, sleepest thou?" Simon, who of all men should be awake, and on the alert! "Coudest not *thou* watch one hour?" Alas! the Messiah was destined to tread the wine-press alone, and of the people there were to be none with Him. After the angel had strengthened Him, the powers of darkness and of light were both against Him. Earth cast Him out, and Heaven hid its face from Him. Then was He "lifted up," above earth and below heaven, into "the Air," to combat "the prince of the power of the air," that "the Father," "having made peace through the blood of His cross," might "by Him reconcile all things unto Himself."

How fearless, too, was Peter of the wiles of Satan the deadly foe of God and man! He had no conception of him as a real personality. The words that would be so appalling to a Christian now—"Satan hath desired to have you"—had no meaning for him then. The tendency of the age was against him. It was wholly towards unbelief. In the eyes of men there was neither God nor devil. Each was but the synonym of an abstract principle—the one of good and the other of evil. The faith of Abraham and the prophets had died out among the Jews. In relinquishing Jehovah's name, they had lost sight of His personality. The knowledge of Him and of Satan as personalities, Jesus had come to revive. And as after His departure this work could only be continued by His apostles; Peter, the chief,

* R. V. and N. T. Com. St. Matt. vi. 13.

was now to be convinced of the existence of Satan, of sin in himself, of his own actual transgression, and of—Christ's forgiveness..

SECTION X.

Peter's Trial and Fall.

Would it be strange if Simon should fall, being, though forewarned, yet so unconcerned and unprepared? All the events of the crucifixion were hurried and rapid. This was a part of Satan's plan; and the disciples, surprised in the garden, were completely bewildered. None of them had laid to heart the words of Christ, and while they were incredulous and negligent, His enemies had been working hard in secret. Their Master alone was able to preserve His equanimity, and command, "Let these go." Let these go! Could they have seen it, this was their Messiah's warrant, that, if faithful to Him, not a hair of their heads should be hurt. But Peter had rashly begun in the flesh, and the Master's order, "Put up thy sword!" was the death-blow to his courage. Despair entered his soul when he found that Jesus would not be defended. And then His conduct, in this respect, being incomprehensible to them, His disciples were "offended because of Him," even John the beloved, "and they all forsook Him, and fled." The Scripture was fulfilled, "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered," for the Messiah was to be deserted by man, and by God.

This was Satan's opportunity. Having forsaken the Lord, Simon was now as weak as an infant, and, like an infant, as susceptible to evil as to good. The Adversary, subtle and cunning as of old, saw his chance and instantly rushed to the breach. Doubtless his tactics were the same for the disciple and the Master, and, as he plied the Messiah, so he plied Peter with taunts and insults unremittingly. His "Christ," and his "Son of the living God," hitherto so invulnerable, he showed him (in the palace of the high priest) must now die like other men! He could not always save Himself. Neither

would God, His "Father," interfere to help Him, nor could He protect His friends. But most of all, Satan knew the secret weakness of Peter's heart, the prejudice inherited and common to all the Jews, but especially to this one, most honest, upright and faithful to the traditions of his fathers; he knew, far better than he, that his innate dread was not of "prison," and torture,, and death." The Jewish church was ever prolific in martyrs, who could boldly die, fearless of these; and Simon Bar-Jona would have been able, by the grace of God, to stand up as nobly as they, to die with the man who had proved Himself greater than all her prophets. But knowing, only too well, his fatal horror of that dreadful death of *hanging*, the only death over which the finger of Jehovah had written "ACCURSED OF GOD," Satan rang without ceasing into his distracted ears the coming cry of the multitude—"Crucify Him!" "Crucify Him!" A double blasphemer, He is worthy to die the death of deaths—accursed of God and man! That foreboding, of which the air was full, together with Simon's sudden recalling of Christ's one solitary prediction, that the Jews should "deliver Him to the Gentiles to *crucify* Him," was enough. Peter, the boastful and confident, was now wholly ready for the devil's purpose.

At the first provocation he declared that he was not a disciple of Jesus of Nazareth. At the second, he protested with an oath, that he knew Him not. And again, at the third, with cursing and swearing, he affirmed the same—"I know not the man"—and Simon, the son of Jonas—nay, Peter, the son of the Christ (for any help in himself) was utterly undone. He had slain the new life within him; he had destroyed his Christian consciousness! By denying, he had cast off highest man. By perjury, he had cast off highest God. There was now no hope for him; not in heaven nor in earth, not in God nor in man. As against his Master, so against him, those powers had all conspired. Earth forsook him. In those three long hours of trial, not a soul came near to chide, or warn, or strengthen him. Even Jesus was kept out of sight.

Heaven hid its face from him. His Lord could not "turn nor "look," till it was too late. And Peter, left alone to the malice of hell and the devil and his own evil heart, was almost—thoroughly lost.

"Almost?" Could he sink any deeper than this?

SECTION XI.

Satan's Success.

Just as in his first great conflict with Christ, in the wilderness, Satan tempted Him with the language of Scripture, so now he tempted Simon Peter. And the words he brought to bear on him were heavy with the wrath of God—"I know thou hast man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou *hang him on a tree*; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise beat him that day; (for HE THAT IS HANGED IS ACCURSED OF GOD: that thy land be not *defiled*, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance." *

With these alarming sounds—"hanged," and "accursed of God"—Satan drove the much-desired prey into his deeply laid and darkly-hidden trap. Those words he knew would be enough to make the living jewel loose itself; and so ready for him to fling from its lofty setting in the pinnacle of the temple, to the hard and rocky ground beneath. Then, with the strength of an archangel and the fury of a demon, he dashed this "glistening stone" to earth. And though there, like the "cock," affrighted, loudly "crew," the devil softly laughed and all his legions with him; for was not Peter, after the Master, the head and front of the coming kingdom? The new "church," against which "the gates of hell should not prevail," had proved most vulnerable. Of its twelve chosen stones, all had fallen. One was broken to pieces, and one was ground to powder. Of its twelve representatives, one had betrayed its head, ten had forsaken Him and fled, and one had forsaken, and fled, and denied Him. Joy, joy for Satan!

* Deut. xxi. 23.

but alas, alas for the church! for *those* were its foundation stones, and *this* its promised "rock."

Possibly, if Simon Peter had been asked to retract his confession, to deny in so many words that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of the living God, he would have frankly and stoutly refused. But Satan was wiser than thus to put him on his guard. He chose to approach him through his own weak humanity, and make him sin a sin of fear, instead of presumption. Unlike his First, the second subject of his attack was not to be reminded that he was "a Son of God." This truth was to be kept in the back-ground. Peter's fall was to be brought about very quietly. He was not to speak the name of Jesus. There was risk in it. This, his questioners were to do. They were merely to assert, and innocently, that he was a disciple, or follower of "Jesus of Nazareth," and Satan would see to the rest. "I know not the *man*," was all that Peter was to say, and the devil's object, thus far, would be obtained. But, even while he yielded to the promptings of Satan, Peter knew that he was denying himself and the Christ. This consciousness it was that angered him, and made him the more "to curse and to swear," and add sin to sin. Unhappy man! The deeper he sank, the purer and holier and greater did Jesus of Nazareth appear to him; and, degraded to the dust, he felt that as surely as Judas betrayed "the innocent blood," he had denied "the Christ," and "the Son of the living God!" What hope was left for him?

SECTION XII.

"I Know not the Man."

And yet, though Simon Bar-Jona never spake a falser, he also never spake a truer word than when he said, "I know not the Man." He knew Him well in the sense that Satan meant he should deny Him, and so saying—"I know him not"—he was guilty of lying. But, in another sense, he did, verily "know Him not;" and thus speaking, he ignorantly told the truth.

By applying to Himself the name of Jehovah, the Jews accused the Christ (and rightly) of making Himself "equal with God" in nature and essence. There was another horn to the altar on which their Messiah sacrificed Himself. In making Himself as *Man*, the Son of God by *generation*, He made God to be Man. His enemies felt this, and, for it, "took up stones to cast at Him," stones which proved to be very stones, and which did "cry out," because, through His intimation and their inference, they were, in their hands, alive and eloquent with this charge. They were as unable to receive *that* truth, as they were able to hold *this*—that man is not God. And yet the *trinity* was as much in their watchword of God is One, as the *unity* is in ours of God is also Three.

Between His *natures*, their Messiah drew a line broad and distinct. They were dissimilar as heaven and earth. But He never divided His *essences*. Alike in quality (human) and in form (triune) they had, without commixture or confusion, been united at His incarnation never again to be sundered. Hence, while its full meaning was yet a secret to all, He delighted in calling Himself, "the Son of *man*." It was His darling title. As the second Adam; it brought Him nearer to God who had made the first and solitary Adam in the "image" of His triunity, and because of that named him "man." It is the Christ's lowest and highest title and name; and, in the order of time, it is the first and the last revelation of His personality. Higher than "the Son of God" which describes only His *natures*, it describes His *essences*. His name of *Jesus* is indeed descriptive of His offices of Saviour and Mediator, and of His natural constitution as such. But in also meaning "the Son of *man*," it is older than either of those. The first Adam was a man, *before* he became a sinner, and the second Adam was *born* his sinless *Son* in order to *become* his Redeemer. Its meaning of "Saviour" only attained its fulness with His death, and its meaning of "Mediator" with His session at the right hand of God. But its highest meaning—MAN—is as old as eternity. Therefore, in being descriptive of His uncreated essence

also, it was elevated to that Name (Jehovah) which till Christ openly claimed it—"I AM"—had been to the Jews unspeakable: "Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven and *things* on earth and *things* under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is LORD,* to the glory of God the Father." †

Christ's *natures* could be changed, but His *essences* never. The *eternal* Son of God could "become flesh" or *temporal*; and He is even represented as putting on man's mortality. The *created* Son of man could, in turn, put on the *uncreated* nature of God. But He could never, at any time, change the *human quality* of either of His essences by becoming unhuman, nor their *triune form* by becoming any other being than man. These are absolutely unchangeable. It may have been the greater comfort and pleasure, therefore, to the Messiah, while undergoing the changes and vicissitudes of our mortal life (and especially death), to hold fast to His manhood, created and uncreated, since both are alike indestructible. The Jews, however, saw only creation and mortality in the title of "the Son of man," and hence their charge of "blasphemy." So did Peter, or he could not have said, "I know not the man." And so did Satan, or he would not have overreached himself by allowing even his innocent tools to use the name of "*Jesus*," when he intended to bring about Simon's *total* fall.

This truth was not revealed to the loving disciple, Peter. He was called to confess no more than the Messiah's eternal divinity. His eternal humanity was reserved for the beloved

* For the full force of the word "Lord" in this passage, the Commentary on New Testament refers the reader to Acts ii. 36, and 1 Cor. xii. 3. According to Smith's Bible Dictionary on the first reference, the word Lord in it, though not so written, means Jehovah. And according to Dr. Hodge's Commentary on the second reference, the word Lord in it, though not so written, means Jehovah. It is taking no liberty then with the text, to write it in the quotation above with *capitals*, to show that there it does, really, signify Jehovah?

† R. V. Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11.

Disciple John who was to imitate it by leaning on the bosom of the Lord and in his old age embody it in his gospel.

SECTION III.

"Behold the Man!"

In the light of His coming, "Behold the Man," whom Pontius Pilate, in those words, ignorantly presented to Jews and Gentiles, and whom they, blind to His person, rejected with the cry, "Away with him, away with him!" "Crucify him, crucify him!" In that light, "Behold the Man," whom Judas just as ignorantly betrayed; whom all the disciples unknowingly forsook; and whom Simon Peter, with cursing and swearing, unwittingly cast off altogether!

This is He, of whom St. Stephen, "being full of the Holy Ghost, and looking up steadfastly into heaven, and seeing the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God," said, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." The sudden revelation of *that* eternity of the Messiah, so illuminated his countenance, that "all who sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel." And that exclamation of his set the climax to the rage of the Jews, so that they "cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city, and stoned him calling upon the Lord."

This "Son of Man" (of *living Man* as well as "living God") is He whom the Messiah, at His trial, assured the high priest and the council they should "henceforth see sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." The *force* of that assertion made the judge "rend his clothes," and ask, "What further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye?" and the jury answer, "He is guilty of death." That *depth* of meaning (felt rather than seen) was the signal offence which made them "spit in his face, and buffet him, and smite him

with the palms of their hands," and say, "Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?"


This "manner of Man"—uncreated as well as created—Pilate, as the representative of the heathen nations, yielded to the Jews "to be crucified;" and the high priest, as the representative of the Jewish church, rejected; and Simon Peter, as the representative of the Christian Church, denied; while Jesus stood alone and confessed Himself as such to His own condemnation and death. Solitary He stood, "that every mouth might be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God;" since by reason of sin and Satan all the world had been rendered powerless to receive God. God had been man's creator in order to become his father. Had Adam not sinned, the welfare of the race would have been insured forever. The perfection of man's being was to be secured by the life of God. By his sin, Adam forfeited God's life for himself and his race. But this—their glorious inheritance and lost Paradise—the last and second Adam came to regain for, and restore unto men. Is it incredible, then, that in his last extremity the Christ should cling solely to His unchangeable essences? His unchangeable nature was covered with mortality. At present, it could afford Him no aid. His changeable nature was about to succumb to death, and would never return. His assumed and momentary character of a sinner was to disappear forever. What indeed was left for Him (and us) but, asserting His manhood, to hold fast to the truth that He was twofold in essence, and, in both, alike human and triune, and further, to declare that "Henceforth" He should be shown to be also alike in His natures, the mortal and temporal having "put on" forever the immortal and eternal.

That "great image" (seen by Nebuchadnezzar in his dream) with "head of gold, breast of silver, thighs of brass, legs of iron, and feet part of iron and part of clay," could not have been "broken to pieces" by the "stone cut out of the mountain without hands," had the Christ (and His Church) whom this "stone" represented, been as unequal in essences as in

natures. Nor would that "stone, that smote the image," have become "a great mountain and filled the whole earth," had all of the Messiah's *humanity* been comprised in that which was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, and so been younger and weaker than His *divinity*. *These* are not unequal. The first halts not a whit behind the last, but with it keeps equal pace. The former is as eternal, or without beginning, as the latter; and, of "the Ancient of Days," the manhood is not a whit inferior to the godhood.

"Behold the Man," whom Simon Peter disowned and renounced in denying Jesus of Nazareth, and judge whether he was not wholly undone! Although ignorant (and Jesus remembered this) of the full height of His personality, yet it was a perfect denial. The Lord had prophesied it with a "Verily, verily, thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me"—*me*—the totality of my being; and Peter knew, too, that in swearing, "I know not the man," "Jesus of Nazareth," he was yielding up the Messiah and all he had confessed of Him. Hence, not a recorder of it adds in excuse or palliation, This did he, "not knowing what he said."

Notwithstanding space had been granted him to reflect and repent, between each attack of Satan, the old life proved too strong for the new in Simon. However, this may be said in extenuation of his sin. Though he denied (actually and virtually) the Messiah in His whole *personality*, he did not deny Him in His *character* of a Saviour; and therefore Peter can afterwards speak boldly of those who "deny the Lord *who bought them*." St. Paul could never forget that he had "beyond measure persecuted the church of God, and wasted it," because he had learned Christ *after* all was fulfilled and revealed, and was then kicking against the strongest convictions that Jesus was their Messiah, and Jehovah, and the Saviour of the world. Peter, at the time of his denial, is not to be judged by what he only learned later, at Pentecost. After their Lord's resurrection, the disciples lingered with Him till His ascension; then, they waited in prayer for the promise to



endue them "with power from on high;" but not till the advent of the Spirit, could they preach Him as the saviour and mediator—the redeemer of sinners.

Believers learn Christ differently, and as He pleases. All are regenerated in the regular order of His life, but, for wise purposes, certain characteristics of it are made to take hold on some more strongly than on others, and consequently the children of Christ differ, like earthly children in showing prominently the varying traits of their parents. Simon had been convinced of just what, and no more, than the Master chose; and in sinning against his one great conviction and confession that Jesus of Nazareth was both David's "Son" and David's "Lord," he sinned against the Holy Ghost, for He had taught him this. But that same Spirit, who should also reveal to him Christ *as a Saviour*, was not, and could not be "given," in His plenitude, till *after* Jesus was "glorified." Hence, that revelation Peter could not receive in its fulness before Pentecost; nor indeed at any time, even in part, till he was first convicted of actual transgression. Therefore he did not at his denial sin against it. Moreover, when he fell, the Messiah's life was not yet marked by His sacrificial death. This death was the chief end Christ had in view when talking "plainly" to the Jews. Those public discourses concerning His origin and person were to result in His being brought before the council and condemned to die, and His voluntary acceptance of crucifixion was to make of Him an atoning sacrifice, and procure the descent of the Spirit, who, through St. Peter, would then offer Jesus of Nazareth to Jews and Gentiles as the complete, perfect and only Saviour.

Christ was indeed to be an "example" to all His followers to the end of time. And He was indeed to be "the propitiation for our sins." But His endurance of the cross (with all it meant for Him) was to so *mark His life* that through His people's actual inheritance of that life, in this world, by regeneration, He would become to them—His sons severely tried—"the Strength of martyrs" and the "King of saints."

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

CONCISE DICTIONARY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE AND GAZETTEER. Edited by Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson, M. A. Associate Editors: Rev. Talbot Wilson Chambers, D.D., LL.D., of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York City, and Rev. Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio. Second and Revised Edition. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1891. Price, \$3.50.

This volume, shortly after it was first published, was briefly noticed in this REVIEW. Its merits, however, especially as it now appears in a second revised and improved edition, entitle it to further consideration. The purpose of its preparation, as stated in its preface, is "to furnish in a concise form, information upon biblical, archæological, ecclesiastical and historical topics."

That there was room for a dictionary of this description cannot be reasonably questioned. Every person desiring to be well informed, as regards religious and ecclesiastical affairs, has long felt the need of some convenient book of this kind. The present work, therefore, supplies a real want. It does this, moreover, in a very acceptable and satisfactory manner. Its vocabulary, first of all, is very large. Scarcely any thing of a religious and ecclesiastical character or bearing has been omitted. Matters of doctrine and ritual, accounts of the various churches and sects and of the different religious orders and societies, as well as biographical sketches of eminent religious leaders and divines, both dead and living, are all to be found in its ample and closely-printed pages. Then the treatment of all the various subjects is concise, but nevertheless full enough for all practical purposes. The information given is indeed in all cases that which is most important and desirable. Furthermore great care has been taken to secure accuracy. After a somewhat extended examination of its pages we have discovered only a very few errors, and these mostly of an unimportant character. One of the errors that has come under our notice is in the article on the "Reformed Church," in which it is stated that "in 1836 Marshall College was founded at Lancaster, Pa.," when in reality it was founded in that year at Mercersburg, Pa., and only removed to Lancaster in 1853, when it was united with Franklin College, located in that city.

Other commendable and useful features of this dictionary are the syllabification of Bible names, with careful indication where the

stress of voice falls; the pronunciation, by respelling phonetically or by other means, of foreign names likely to be mispronounced; and the mention at the close of the respective articles of such literature as would enable the student to pursue his investigations further. The latter feature will be found especially serviceable to ministers and others who may be desirous of perfecting their knowledge as regards any particular subject.

The value of this second edition is moreover increased by the addition of a Gazetteer, consisting of fine, large maps, together with a complete index to each map. These maps have been expressly prepared for this work, and embody the latest results of research in the countries represented. They are respectively entitled, *The Lands of the Holy Scriptures, Palestine, The Countries Around the Mediterranean Sea During the Crusades, The Church Provinces about 1500 A. D., and the Protestants and Catholics in Middle Europe about 1550 A. D.* The addition of these maps with their indexes greatly increases the convenience and usefulness of the work.

We would heartily commend the book to the attention of all our readers. Ministers and Sunday school teachers will especially find it very serviceable, as it is admirably suited for constant use. In our opinion no better book of the kind has yet been published.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. Driver, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891. pp. xxxi and 522. Price, \$2.50.

This is the first volume of a newly-projected Theological Library under the editorial care of Dr. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, and Dr. Salmond, of Free Church College, Aberdeen. The enterprise is of an international character, and the ablest specialists in the several departments of theological science in England, Scotland and America have been engaged to carry it out. The Library will represent the best Christian scholarship of the age. Each volume, of moderate compass, but compact, will be complete in itself; taken together the volumes will cover the whole field of theology. It is a highly important undertaking, and cannot fail to exert a profound and healthy influence on the mind of the Church.

The series opens fitly with an "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament." We heartily welcome this volume. It meets a long-felt need. One is often asked, "What shall I read, that I may acquaint myself with the present state of Old Testament Criticism?" Heretofore there has been little in the English language that one could recommend, as giving a fair representation, not only of the results revealed by the ablest critics, but also of the facts on which these results are based. Such a presentation has now been given us by the competent hand of Dr. Driver. He is Pusey's successor as Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. He acquired a

name first in the sphere of philology, and stands in the front rank of Old Testament scholars. His work on "The Hebrew Tenses" is the standard authority on that subject in Germany, as well as in England and America. He next entered the field of textual criticism, and his "Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel," published in 1890, has added greatly to his already high reputation. Now he appears in a new rôle, as literary critic, for which he seems to be remarkably well qualified. To faith in divine revelation and profound reverence for the Bible as the record of that revelation, he joins a broad general scholarship, a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language, an intimate familiarity with every part of the Old Testament, a well-balanced judgment that knows how to discriminate between the certain and the merely probable, a strong love of the truth and a calm courage in setting it forth. From such a man we expect much; and we do not hesitate to say that his latest work meets all just expectations. We can, of course give no detailed account of it in this brief notice. It must suffice to say that his method is historico-critical, and that his conclusions on all the vexed questions of Old Testament criticism are in the main those now held, rightly or wrongly, by the overwhelming majority of Biblical scholars.

PEOPLE'S COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL *according to John*. By Edwin W. Rice, D.D., Philadelphia: The American Sunday-School Union, 1891. Price, \$1.25.

This book pleases us very much. As a commentary for the people it could not easily be excelled. The author has succeeded in compressing, within a small compass, a large amount of matter, critical, exegetical and historical, very helpful to a clear understanding of this most spiritual of the Gospels. At the foot of the page, in parallel columns, are given both the Common Version and the Revised Version with the American readings and renderings. The Gospel is divided into sections, each prefaced by a statement of the place and time of the recorded events, and by introductory remarks that throw much light on the section as a whole. The comments on the text are brief, but judicious and to the point, and display a careful study of the latest and best results of Biblical research. The book throughout is scholarly. This is apparent in the Introduction, which covers 24 pages, setting forth in compact form the external and internal evidence for John's authorship; the various theories of modern critics, negative and positive; the latest discoveries bearing on the question of genuineness; the author and object of the Gospel; the time and place of composition; the characteristics of the fourth Gospel; and its relation to the three Synoptics. We can conceive of nothing better adapted to the needs of the Sunday-school teacher, especially as it is accompanied by a map, the latest (1890) of the Palestine Fund, and by engravings from original and trustworthy sources, which lend much value and interest to the book.

THE SÆNGERFEST SERMONS. By James Boyd Brady, B.D., D.D., Pastor of Franklin Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Newark, N. J. Newark, N. J., Advertiser Printing House, 1891. Price, \$1.50.

These sermons were called forth by what was regarded as a violation of the Sabbath by the "Great German Sængerfest," in their grand quadrennial in Newark, N. J., during which they held one of their festivals on the Christian Sunday, July 5th, 1891. They are a popular appeal for what is called the American Sabbath over against the continental Sunday. They are full of warm feeling and enthusiasm and no doubt produced a decided effect upon the large audiences that heard them. So far as the "Sængerfest" violated the laws of New Jersey they certainly were in the wrong and merited condemnation. So far as the general question of Sabbath observance is concerned we side with the American Sabbath. And yet, in doing so we cannot justify the Puritan idea of the Sabbath, which no doubt in some measure has provoked the reaction we behold against it, especially among the Germans. The Puritan Sabbath is more Jewish than Christian. What we need in this country is a Christian Sunday that shall be neither Puritan nor Continental, but such as was proclaimed by our Lord and observed by the Apostolic Church. We do not find in these sermons a treatment of the question as to how the Christian Sunday differs from the Jewish; and yet this difference needs to be determined in order to find a proper basis for our advocacy of Sunday observance. Some indeed maintain that the laws of Sabbath observance should be very strict because if one point is yielded more will be demanded; but it is better to have moderate laws and insist on their observance than the strictest rules that cannot be carried out. In our country this question challenges solution. It is of great importance and the churches should seek to mould public sentiment in favor of a quiet, orderly Sunday. Some years ago we spent a Sunday in Ayre, Scotland, the land of Burns, and on Saturday the town was overrun with drunkenness on the part of male and female, while the Sunday was as quiet as a graveyard. In Germany we found great freedom on Sunday, especially in southern Germany, but less disorder and excess on week-day. What we need in America is a medium between the two extremes, and such a Sunday the American people will sustain. We commend these sermons in their opposition to the desecration of the Lord's day.

ΚΟΛΑΣΙΣ ΑΙΩΧΙΟΣ; or Future Retribution. By George W. King, Pastor of the Broadway Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence, R. I. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.00.

An able discussion of the doctrine of eternal punishment. Why the Greek terms should be used in designating the title of the book is not evident. The work is divided into eight chapters, and these chapters discuss: 1. The eternity of punishment; 2. Objections and

arguments of Restorationists; 3. New Testament terminology respecting future retribution; 4. The ground of future endless retribution; or, for what are the wicked punished eternally; 5. The number of the lost; 6. The nature of future punishment; 7. The doctrine of annihilation; 8. The reason or law of necessity in future punishment.

The argument from Scripture is ably handled and quite satisfactory. With this we prefer to rest. The explanation by reason of the presence of sin and suffering in the universe is very difficult, and the eternity of future sin and suffering is a mystery which the human reason perhaps cannot compass, because we can think only within the limits of time and space, and therefore what is beyond reason here will doubtless become more evident hereafter. Still the author has done well in answering the objections to this Scripture doctrine. We may rest in the teachings of God's Word, whether we can explain it fully to reason or not. The work is prepared in the best style and reflects credit on the publishers.

THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE LIFE. By James Strong, S.T.D., LL.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, 60 cents.

This little work discusses the nature of God, as the unembodied Spirit, the embodied Spirit, man, the disembodied spirit, the soul after death and before the resurrection, and the re-embodied spirit, man after the resurrection. It is conservative in spirit, not venturing into vain speculations, but confining the discussions to what is revealed on these mysterious subjects. The author argues against a temporary body for the soul in the intermediate state, and seems to regard angels as unembodied spirits, but his assertions on both these subjects are very guarded. He seldom ventures beyond what is clearly revealed, and when he does it is in a very conservative spirit. We commend the book as worthy of being carefully read.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. By Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. In Two Volumes, Vol. I. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street (near Broadway), 1891. Price, \$1.50.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and Vicar of All Saints', Blackrock. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street (near Broadway), 1871. Price, \$1.50.

Both these volumes belong to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible," and both are possessed of conspicuous merit.

This first volume on the Gospel of St. John by Professor Marcus Dods is, indeed, a most admirable popular exposition of the first eleven chapters of this important portion of Scripture. In a clear, flowing and pointed style he gives a perfectly intelligible explana-

tion of their contents, and shows their intimate relation to the purpose which the Apostle had in view in writing them, namely, to promote the belief that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." In his introductory note, Dr. Dods says, concerning this Gospel, that "in the whole range of literature there is no composition a more perfect work of art, or which more rigidly excludes whatever does not subserve its main end. From the first word to the last, there is no paragraph, sentence, or expression which is out of place, or with which we could dispense." The truth of this statement becomes very evident as one follows Dr. Dods in his lucid and masterly exposition of the Gospel.

Professor Stokes' volume is also a superior work. In it we are given an exposition of the Acts of the Apostles down to, but not including, the conversion of St. Paul and the baptism of Cornelius, *i. e.*, of the first nine chapters. It has to do, therefore, with the beginning of the Christian Church, and treats of the incidents therewith connected in a highly interesting and instructive manner. Though a decided Churchman, Professor Stokes has been careful to say nothing which can really hurt the feelings of any one occupying a different standpoint. His work, as well as that of Dr. Dods, is a valuable contribution to popular theological literature, and will repay study.

THE SERMON BIBLE. St. Luke I. to St. John III. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street (near Broadway), 1891. Price, \$1.50.

This is the third volume of this work on the New Testament, and the seventh of the whole series. Its general features are in every respect the same as those of the preceding volumes, all of which have been noticed more or less fully in different numbers of this REVIEW. Rightly used, it is a work which will prove helpful to ministers generally. Its outlines of sermons are both suggestive and instructive, and its reference to works bearing on the different texts will be found especially serviceable.

ST. MATTHEW'S WITNESS to Words and Works of the Lord, or Our Saviour's Life as Revealed in the Gospel of His Earliest Evangelist. By Francis W. Upham, LL.D., Author of "The Church and Science: or, The Ancient Hebrew Idea of the Days of Creation," etc., etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.20.

The character of this work is well set forth on its title page. Its purpose is to direct attention to and explain the meaning of the words and works of Jesus as these are presented in the Gospel of St. Matthew. In its general character it is popular and practical, rather than critical. It is written in an easy, flowing and attractive style, and is in every way well suited to meet the wants of the general reader. It is a book that is worthy a place both in the family and in the Sunday-school library.

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. II. *Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.* *Leviticus and Numbers*, by Daniel Steele, D.D.; *Deuteronomy*, by John W. Lindsay, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, \$2.00.

This volume forms part of Whedon's Old and New Testament Commentary, the object of which is to furnish information concerning the Scriptures for popular use. It has accordingly been prepared, not so much with a view to the wants of the advanced student as to those of the general reader. On this account its character is predominantly expository, rather than critical. Nevertheless the work has been executed with great care and with due reference to the results of scientific and historical criticism, so that it is fully abreast the biblical knowledge of the times in which we live. In tone it is throughout thoroughly evangelical. For the purpose for which it is intended we know of no better commentary on the books of which it treats.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES. A Guide to the Study of the Sunday School Lessons for 1892, Including Original and Selected Expositions, Plans of Instruction, Illustrative Anecdotes, Practical Applications, Archæological Notes, Library References, Maps, Pictures, Diagrams. By Jesse L. Hurlbut, D.D., and Robert R. Doherty, Ph.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.25.

This work has been especially prepared for the benefit of Sunday-school teachers during the present year. In it the International Lessons for the year are carefully expounded and illustrated, and teachers are given hints for instruction and library references, by means of which they may attain still further knowledge of the subject under consideration. Of the various books of the kind it is one of the very best. No Sunday-school teacher who will study it carefully can fail to be well prepared to impart instruction to his pupils. The essence of a library may be truly said to be concentrated in this one volume.

BOSTON HOMILIES. Short Sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1892. By Members of the Alpha Chapter of the Convocation of the Boston University. Second Series. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.25.

This volume consists, as stated on its title-page of homilies or short sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for the present year. These homilies have all been prepared with great care and furnish a large amount of useful information and instruction. They are more especially intended for the Sunday-school teachers and older scholars, but may be profitably read by all classes of persons. Ministers who are in the habit of lecturing on the Sunday-school lessons for the benefit of their Sunday-school teachers and scholars will particularly find them suggestive and helpful.

WESLEY ON ORATORY. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price 10 cents.

This small booklet of twenty pages consists of an article on Oratory and Elocution by the distinguished founder of Methodism. It will amply repay careful reading, and should be thoroughly studied by all who would excel in public speaking.

CALENDAR AND CHART. Illustrating the Years, Periods and Events as Recorded in the Life of Our Lord, in their Chronological Order. Prepared for the Use of Sunday-schools, Normal Classes, etc. By George P. Perry. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price (cloth 5 feet square), \$3.50; mounted on rollers, \$5.00; Paper, size, 20x28, 40 cts.; folded in cloth cover, 75 cts.

This is an exceedingly convenient and instructive Calendar and Chart. By means of it the different events of the Life of Christ are so presented that by a single glance their various relations may be learned. We would heartily commend it to the attention of all ministers and Sunday-school Superintendents and workers.

PHARAOHS, FELLAHS AND EXPLORERS. By Amelia B. Edwards. Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brother, Franklin Square, 1892. Price, \$4.00.

This volume contains, with large additions, notes and references, the substance of a course of lectures recently delivered in this country by the author. In every respect it is a most delightful book. Its fine, heavy paper, its large, clear type, its many fine and interesting illustrations, and its handsome binding make it a perfect feast for the eyes, while its wonderful account of early civilization and art, its charming style, and its thorough and accurate learning make it a no less perfect feast for the imagination and the reason. We would advise our readers to secure a copy of it, and, if they do so, we feel assured they will not regret their purchase.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London; Author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," "The Priesthood of Christ," "Springdale Abbey," "The Inner Life of Christ," "Ad Clerum," "The Ark of God," "Apostolic Life," "Tyne Chylde," "Weaver Stephen," "Every Morning," "The People's Family Prayer Book, etc., etc. Vol. XV.—Isaiah xxvii.—Jeremiah xix. New York, London and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company. Price, \$1.50.

This is the fifteenth volume of the "People's Bible" on the Old Testament. As, however, six volumes of the work have been already published on the New Testament, this is really the twenty-first volume of the series. Only four more volumes will, therefore, be required to complete the work, and, considering the rapidity with which the different volumes have heretofore appeared, it will not be long now before the whole series will be published. When we think of the other works written by Dr. Parker, it is really surprising that

he should be able to complete in so short a time a work so extensive and as able as the "People's Bible" and his so doing is in itself a striking evidence of superior mental endowments on his part.

In merit the present volume is fully equal to any of those that have preceded it. The same brilliant rhetoric, happy exposition and striking application of divine truth, that have made the earlier volumes so popular, will be found in this also. Among the titles of topics discussed are the following: A Denunciation of Drunkenness; The Doom of Ariel; Plain Speaking; The Source of Strength; Prophetic Warnings; Unconscious Providences; Contending Emotions; Dramatized Truth; Divine Questions: etc.

FAITH, HOPE, LOVE AND DUTY. By Daniel Wise, D.D. Author of *Path of Life*, *Plains of Promise*, *Our King and Son*, etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1891. Price, \$1.

This book is made up of short paragraphs, illustrative and explanatory of Christian faith, hope, love and duty. These paragraphs originally appeared as editorials in the columns of the *Zion's Herald*. They embody much important truth pithily expressed, and can scarcely fail to be spiritually and morally helpful to those who read them. We commend the book to the readers of this REVIEW, as one that can profitably be taken up at odd moments.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1892.

I.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES IN RELATION TO HIS PERSONALITY.

BY THE REV. EML. V. GERHART, D.D., LL.D.

THE person of our Lord conditions the peculiar elements of His ministry. Identified with the Adamic race suffering the miseries of sin, He is distinguished by love to the race, a love which characterizes His personal history from the beginning to the end. Righteous love is active in two ways: in what He does, and in what He says.

His doings and His sayings correspond to His personality. Jesus was what no man ever had been, He became what no man ever had become; therefore He did what no man had ever done, and He spake as no man had ever spoken.

Contrasted with the works done by other mighty men, His deeds were 'miracles;' contrasted with the doctrines taught by other great teachers, His words were 'spirit' and 'life.' His words and His deeds fit the Son of Man.

The conquests of Alexander answer to his military genius, the resources of his country and the bravery of his troops. So the conquests of Jesus over diseases, demoniacal possessions,

and over death, answer to the superior authority of His divine-human Personality. The philosophy of Plato answers to his metaphysical insight and powers of profound thought; so the new teaching of Jesus respecting God and man answers to the new consciousness of ideal manhood.

Moved by the love of fallen mankind to take the form of a servant and become obedient unto death, the Son of God became the Mediator that men might share the triumphant life which He lived and know the truth which He was.

The ministry of the Mediator was the impartation of His fulness to all classes who were capable of receiving His gifts.* The new blessings given by miracle and by parable presuppose the new spiritual resources which He developed and realized in Himself.

I.

The deeds of our Lord are to be studied, first, *in relation to Himself*, then *in relation to the persons and things* these deeds were wrought upon. In both relations His deeds, however wonderful, were *natural*. They were done in accord with His own nature, and in accord with the nature of men and of things.

The miracle which above all others appeals to faith and reason is His own personal history; yet this personal history is neither unhuman nor unnatural.

The extraordinariness of His personality as presented by the books of the New Testament we cannot but see and feel. Contrasted with all heroes of ancient and modern times, or with the best teachers of religion, He stands alone. Between Him and the noblest among pious men there is a deep, broad chasm.

Though Abraham and Moses, David, Samuel and Isaiah were chosen men of Jehovah who lived on a spiritual level far higher than any pagan seeker after God, yet no lawgiver, nor seer, nor prophet of the Old Testament furnishes a criterion of judgment. So far above them all does His personality tower that John Baptist, than whom there was none greater among them that

* Of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." John 1: 16.

are born of women, pronounced himself not worthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of His shoes.*

A similar contrast is evident when we compare the Master with His disciples. Though he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John Baptist, yet the life of no apostle is the perfect image of the life of his Lord. John and James, Peter and Paul, are wonderful revelations of a new, an uplifting and transforming virtue, yet in point of moral character and divine consciousness they are of inferior rank. He is the pattern, they are reflections; He is without sin, they confess themselves sinners; He realizes the divine idea of man, they are the imperfect witnesses of Him; He is the fountain of a new vitality, a new righteousness, a new spiritual strength, they receive their inspiration with all their new powers from Him.

Reason cannot account for the character of Jesus, a Man who whilst living on the ordinary human plane, in sympathy with all the needs and all the woes of His fellow-men stands forth the reality of an ideal never before attempted or even conceived, by recognizing in Him only the best endowments of the Hebrew people. A life, a character so new, so extraordinary, so opposite to the accepted principles of the noblest men, presupposes an extraordinary personality. Jesus Christ is the one great Miracle of the Christian religion.

In the degree that we rise to a perception of the Miracle which His personal history sets before us, we may get an insight into the naturalness of His character and of His wonderful works. Does the ideal of any philosopher, pagan or Christian, satisfy the aspirations of the human reason? Does not every great man aim at a kind of perfection higher than that to which he has attained? Is any truly human ideal of character or of achievement, however exalted, irrational? Does not the age and the world support and commend the endeavor after extraordinary achievements for the well-being of mankind? Does not the man who accomplishes great things for

* Matt. 11: 11; Luke 7: 28; John 1: 27.

his age command enthusiastic approval? Does he not lose respect in the degree that he fails of a high aim?

When Jesus sets before Himself an ideal of love to God and love to man, of self-sacrifice for the salvation and blessedness of His enemies, an ideal which distinguishes Him above all great and good men, does not such a high purpose accord with the dictates of sound reason? Is such an ideal not truly in living sympathy with our purest aspirations? Does it not accord with the best elements of man's nature?

Inasmuch as Jesus proposes to Himself an aim which distinguishes Him from all other men, sound reason demands that He demonstrate His claim to respect and confidence by the realization of His aim. Did He or did He not succeed? There is no occasion for argument in support of an affirmative answer. That He was the extraordinary Reality which He proposed to Himself is conceded even by some of the most learned of His enemies. Is such reality natural or unnatural?

Is it unnatural to evolve an ideal of manhood purer, higher than the ideals of all other men? Is it unnatural to resolve that ideal into reality, and set it without flaw or blemish before the eyes of the world? Is it superhuman, or is it truly human, to touch the richest possibilities of man's divine imageship?

No; the personal life of Jesus was neither unhuman nor unnatural. The Miracle of miracles, whilst it reveals a Presence other than the laws of nature, other than the endowments of the Adamic race, is nevertheless in sympathy with the laws of nature and responsive to the dictates of sound reason.

II.

From a person who is Himself a miracle we look for miraculous deeds. From a man whose character is extraordinary we may expect extraordinary words. Reason asks for works and words that answer to personality.

Jesus Christ was pre-eminently the Man of deeds. He came into the world, not chiefly to teach new doctrines, but to *do* new

truth. His personality and His works were the presupposition of all His words.

His deeds done in the service of mankind are to be studied under a twofold aspect: in their relation to men as *men*, bearing God's image, capable of God's love; then also in their relation to man's *enemies*, including all the ills of his fallen condition.

Formed in God's image, men are by their creation predestinated for the perfect communion of love with God. They have a hidden intrinsic capacity to be wrought upon by the miraculous works done by Jesus. Their nature has a susceptibility akin to the capacities of His own human nature. His aim it was by doing the will of His Father to make Himself the archetype of a new manhood, a manhood of which the primeval man was the figure.* At every cost, opposed by the enmity of wicked men, assailed by Satan, Jesus persisted with unyielding firmness in the work of realizing and consummating the glory of *true* manhood.

By His works and His words He aimed to make all men what He was. The consummation set before Him by the Father for Himself was the consummation which He set for others; for in all men He recognizes the possibility of attaining in union with Himself, by the obedience of faith, to a manhood pure, perfectly righteous, divinely holy, like His own.

On the basis of this principle He forms a kingdom out of sinful men, changed by a new birth of the Spirit into likeness to Himself, a kingdom in which He reigns as King, a kingdom which differs from the kingdoms of the world as He differs from other kings. Says our Lord: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister, and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." †

*Rom. 5: 14.

† Mk. 10: 42-45; Matt. 20: 28.

The authority of His kingdom is the authority of love, not the love of a father to a son, nor of a patriot to his country, such as may be seen among the civilized nations of paganism, nor that purer love, examples of which appear in some of the best representatives of the Hebrew nation; but that self-sacrificing love for all men, for 'the evil and the good,' for 'the just and the unjust,'* in the service of God, of which Jesus is the beginning; the love which perceives in every man, every woman, every child, the inborn capability of God-like perfection, of a blessedness akin to the eternal blessedness of God; and therefore takes delight in consecrating time and strength, talent and genius, even life itself, to the work of raising the wicked from the 'horrible pit' of sin to the divine plane of righteousness and wisdom.†

Of His kingdom He is the only foundation; "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."‡ This foundation is laid in man's nature no less than decreed by God's sovereign will. Extraordinary as is the fundamental principle of His kingdom and the law by which His kingdom is governed; fierce as was the war waged against it by the enmity of the Jew and the Gentile, the kingdom is nevertheless in reality a natural kingdom. It was and it is just what the nature of the Adamic race needed, what nature yearned after, what it struggled by inventions of its own to establish, and what men by their natural endowments had a fitness to enter. There is no principle of the kingdom, no precept, no maxim, no ordinance, not even a word contrary to any law of mind or body. Instead, all the gifts of the kingdom and all its demands, demonstrate it to be the complement and the joy of genuine manhood.

Answering to the deepest needs of the nature of men, and aiming at their positive perfection, the works of Jesus were done in opposition to sin. From this alien principle moral evils and physical evils arise. The enemy of sin, Jesus waged war against sin; and He did His works for the destruction of

* Matt. 5: 45.

† Ps. 40: 2.

‡ 1 Cor. 3: 11.

the ills to which the sinful race is heir. Blindness, deafness, lameness, fevers, paralysis, leprosy, demoniacal possessions, death, and all the pains and sorrows attending these evils are contrary to human nature and to our natural instincts. Each is a violation of manhood, being inimical to the life of the body and the well-being of the soul. It is not forgiveness that violates the laws of nature, but transgression and guilt. It is not an effectual remedy, not miraculous interposition, that interrupts and suspends the harmonies of the family and the State, but sickness, diseases, death.

The miraculous healings recorded in the Gospels declare the superior authority of Jesus Christ to be in profoundest sympathy with man's nature; no less also with the nature of sub-human kingdoms. Jesus honors all natural laws. So far from violating, or suspending, or even for an instant disturbing the original equipoise of man's complex organization, or interrupting the harmony between man and lower kingdoms, every miraculous cure asserted the fundamental rights of humanity by attacking the abnormal principle from which the ills of life proceed, and by overwhelming the Adversary of the good and the right. The Author of nature honors nature. The Man who is the true ideal of manhood is the enemy, not of natural law, but of the transgression of natural law.

If we get a clear insight into the naturalness of the works of Jesus, into His devotion to the hidden truth of man, and to the harmony between man and lower kingdoms, the great number of wonderful cures* wrought by His touch or His word will appear to be like refreshing streams flowing from a new fountain of human vitality opened in the barren desert.

The Synoptists prove the historicity of their records by the very fact that they contain an account of these miracles. If

* Matthew says: And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people. And the report of Him went forth into all Syria; and they brought unto Him all that were sick, holden with divers diseases and torments, possessed with devils, and epileptic, and palsied; and He healed them.—4: 23, 24.

miracles were wanting in the record, their absence would indicate that in the actual history of Jesus they did not occur; and reasoning from the absence of miracles in His actual history, it would follow, either that His works did not correspond to the perfect naturalness of His personality, or that His personality did not in truth realize the ideal superiority of man over nature's ills. His personal history would have come short of genuine manhood, would as really have been wanting in naturalness as is the personal history of all other great men.

III.

Proceeding on the same general principle, we may form a correct judgment concerning other classes of our Lord's miraculous works. When Jesus walks upon the turbulent waves of the Sea of Galilee, or commands the storm to be still, and it obeys His word; or when He directed Peter to go to the sea, cast a hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up to find a shekel in his mouth in order therewith to pay tribute; or says to the fruitless fig tree, Let there be no fruit from thee henceforward forever, and immediately the fig tree withered away, He asserts and declares the original superiority of man over the kingdoms of nature. Such extraordinary acts display the purpose of God in forming man after His own image.

Of the primeval family it is written: God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth." Seizing the truth of Genesis, the eighth Psalm hymns the praises of Jehovah in the same lofty strain:

What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?
 And the son of man, that Thou visitest him?
 For Thou hast made him but little lower than God,
 And crownest him with glory and honor.
 Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands.
 Thou hast put all things under his feet.

When Jesus commands the angry sea we have a manifestation

of the true dignity of man as king of the natural world, a definite expression of the irresistible might with which man's will may put in subjection under his feet the disorganizing forces of lower realms. He simply fulfils the prophecies of the Old Testament.

On the same principle we interpret the miracle of feeding five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes. When they have all eaten and are filled, the disciples take up twelve basketfuls of the broken pieces. This extraordinary transaction accords with the *original* laws and the true teleology of nature. Jesus touches the hidden synthesis, on the one side, between impersonal nature and the will of its Author immanent in its laws, and on the other side He asserts the hidden synthesis of human personality with the economy of the lower world. Nature anticipates man, anticipates the ideal man. To be truly natural, to fulfil its mission, nature needs man's presence, needs the benediction of his personality to be active in it and upon it.

This principle is applicable to the miracle of Cana in Galilee. Jesus ordered six water-pots of stone to be filled with water, and when the servants obeyed His command, Draw out now, and bear to the ruler of the feast, the water became wine. The exertion of His miracle-working power was neither arbitrary, nor was He ambitious of vain display. There was a want of wine at the marriage. Our Lord interposes to supply this want. Here, as in other instances, an evil is impending; and the evil is one of the consequences of prevalent disorganization. His act of interposition reveals His kingship over nature. Agreeably to the word in Genesis, He, the ideal Man, has dominion 'over all the earth'; and the exercise of this dominion expresses in a figure the human design of His Presence. Nature is made for man, not man for nature. Nature is man's servant; and when by the force of His will Jesus turns water into wine in the service of man, He works after the method of the ideal Man, who has an intuitive perception of the relations of nature to His kingdom, neither seen nor

tangible by ordinary men. The miracle images the truth that His kingdom not only removes all actual evils, but at the same time also supplies all individual and social needs.* His kingdom is profitable for all things, having the promise of the life which now is and of that which is to come.

In performing the miracle in Cana He proves Himself to be equal to His claims. Does He not profess to have come to be the Saviour of the world? The salvation which He brings means deliverance from *all* evils, whether of body or soul, whether of the individual, or the family, or the state. Can any rational objection be made to such a salvation? Does not the judgment of men everywhere bear witness to two things: that such a comprehensive salvation is needed, and that such salvation can come neither from nature, nor from philosophy, nor natural science, nor culture, nor material progress? Universal judgment by implication affirms that if deliverance be possible, it must come from One who not only differs from ordinary men, but who also as regards wisdom and power is qualified at will to command all the forces of Good and of Evil, natural and spiritual.

Is it then rational to raise objections to the wonderful deeds of Christ because, claiming to be the Saviour of the world from all evils, He makes good His claim? or inasmuch as the methods of ordinary men are a universal failure He makes good His claim by methods of His own? Could Jesus do things that no men have ever done if His method did not differ from ordinary methods? Would not the absence of methods, and of results peculiar to Himself involve a reflection on the perfection of His character? If claiming to be the complete Saviour He should like other physicians stand powerless before leprosy, or should be dumb in the presence of the bier and the tomb, only weeping with those that weep, would not this lack of ability to afford extraordinary relief in an extraordinary emergency declare Him to be only a man like other men, not the mighty

* Seek ye first His kingdom, and His righteousness; and all other things shall be added unto you.—Matt. 6: 33.

Saviour, and declare His kingdom to be of this world, not the kingdom of God?

When Christology refers the authority with which Jesus rebukes the storm, and the power with which He multiplies the loaves and the fishes, or walks on the surface of the sea, exclusively to His divinity, it overlooks fundamental Christian truth. The Gospels lose one element of their peculiar significance, and the manhood of Jesus is divested of the unique dignity which the New Testament ascribes to Him. As affecting our judgment of Jesus it means nothing when Christology says that God can do all things, that God governs in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth. Christianity is not needed to teach us that. So much we learn even from the light of nature.* If Christianity means no more than this: that God can forgive sins: that God changes man's heart; that God can calm the turbulent waves; that God can give sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, and the vigor of health to the leper;—if Christianity means no more, it is as to kind no advance on Judaism; it would only set forth more clearly, more definitely, what we learn from the Old Testament. If we accept no more, we lose sight of the virtue of the new principle, that "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." This new principle as represented by the New Testament requires us to believe that the human nature of Jesus, because *truly human*, was even while on earth the adequate organ of His divine nature for the fulfilment of His mission in the state of humiliation. Like Himself, His wonderful works are divine-human, as really human as divine; and His works prove themselves to be divine by the fact that in fulfilment of the original idea of man they are truly human.

Of the transforming power of true manhood over lower kingdoms we have a prophecy in the arts of civilization. Art and science turn the desert into a garden, multiply the fertility of the soil, and bring to light secret possibilities of vegetable and animal life. What ordinary men accomplish through various inventions and instrumentalities, the Son of Man does by a

* Rom. 1: 20.

method of His own, the silent exercise of His righteous will. In all its realms, in all its laws, in its relations backward to God and forward to man, nature is responsive to His plastic touch, because human personality and impersonal nature are members of one system, nature being man's material foundation, and personality the apex and complement of nature.

To complete a Scriptural conception of our Lord's miracles it is needful to emphasize their *chief design*. All His works derive their meaning from their direct connection with the founding of His kingdom.

The type, the law and ultimate end of His kingdom is Himself. In it and by it the distinguishing qualities of His personality are to be realized. His own attitude toward God, His own attitude toward the Adamic race, toward nature and the kingdom of darkness is as to its purpose the attitude of His kingdom. As His person is superior to the disintegrating forces of the natural world; as no disease, no sickness could seize Him with its fatal grasp, nor death itself, which of His own will He suffered, could hold Him in subjection, so the kingdom founded on His person is intrinsically superior to all human ills. The healing of bodily and mental diseases, the raising of the dead and the removal of all kinds of human misery were the natural operation of the genius of His kingdom, on the one hand answering to the demands of human nature, and on the other prophetic of an intrinsic energy adequate to the entire emancipation of the race.

Wrought for the removal of moral and physical evils, the works of Jesus had at the same time a profound positive significance. His miracles were more than antidotes. Jesus laid hold of the normal order of human life, and the normal order of the natural world, the order which underlies disorganization and misery. He touched latent possibilities of soul and body, and developed these possibilities into realities. Discerning and asserting the original purpose and the ideal development of humanity, He overcame evils by a quickening and recuperative force active from within. Deafness, blindness, lameness, paraly-

sis He heals by reviving the suppressed vitality of the subject, thus honoring and enthroning the rights of original laws. As a physician overcomes sickness by protecting or stimulating the natural vitality of his patient, so the Great Physician by the force of His penetrating will quickens the capacities of suffering men, capacities unknown and inaccessible to ordinary medical skill; by vivifying and unfolding slumbering powers He neutralizes and abolishes the poison of moral and physical evil.

Two things He does for suffering mankind by one act: the one removing the external phenomena of mental and bodily diseases, the other destroying the cause of these phenomena lodged in the interior constitution. All who are accessible to His spiritual power of healing are not only delivered from external ills, but they are also lifted up to a nobler plane of life on which they move with new vigor, new strength, new hope.

IV.

The words and the deeds of Jesus Christ are integral parts of the one ministry. Miracles are truth confronting us in the character of transactions. Words are deeds wrought out in language. As the statue is poetry in marble, so the parable is life-giving might in articulate speech.

Deeds and words are expressions of the same personality. Each is the medium through which His life and salvation are freely imparted to men dead in sin and subject to the curse of violated law. Of the two modes of ministration, the deed, the transaction, is the richer manifestation, because under the form of reality it embodies and reveals more of the wealth of His personality.

This proposition is valid respecting the objective history of Jesus Christ as compared with the record of Him in the words of either of the four Gospels. The fact of His miraculous conception and birth has more virtue and meaning than the account written by Matthew and Luke can express. So in regard to the crucifixion and resurrection. The reality of His death is fundamental; it has more solemn significance than the words

of Jesus foretelling it bring to light, or than the words of the apostles who bear witness to the fact can teach. As regards the resurrection, no words of Scripture furnish us an adequate insight into its nature. The mystery of the crucifixion and the resurrection we approach in the Spirit by faith; and unquestionably we have to study each through the agency of the inspired record. But the principal Object of our faith, the ground of our undying hope, is the Reality from which evangelical speech derives its unfathomable meaning.

Of like kind is the relation of the words spoken by Jesus Christ to the fundamental Miracle, to His Personality and His personal history on earth and in heaven. Inasmuch as He was a Man such as no one had been before, such as no one has been since, He spake as no one has ever spoken. The Truth which He was and which He lived was a breadth and length, a height and depth, which by the common consent of Christendom no believer, no theologian, has yet measured. For this reason the words of Jesus as written by the evangelists presuppose an import, a hidden wealth of virtue, which the mind of the evangelists did not fathom,—a wealth which by the Christian may be more and more clearly discerned as by the Holy Spirit He grows in positive fellowship with the life of Christ. Communion in the Spirit with Christ Himself conditions better insight into the import of evangelical words.

The lack of a distinct recognition of the relation which the personality and the deeds of our Lord bear to His words has betrayed some scholars into a partial undervaluing of the Synoptists. A sentiment has been gaining currency which, by overlooking the peculiar worth of Matthew, Mark and Luke, extols the Fourth Gospel disproportionately, extols it because, whilst recording but few miracles, it contains, with the exception of the Sermon on the Mount, the richest discourses of our Lord. Negative criticism attacks the Gospel of John because of these profound discourses, and attacks the Synoptists on account of the many miracles which they record. Apologetics

has proceeded largely on the silent assumption that the Fourth Gospel is the principal book. Corresponding to this silent assumption that the discourses of our Lord are the fundamentals of Christianity, not a few learned men have felt called upon to apologize for the many miracles of the Synoptists, even to explain away the historicity of some of them by denying or questioning the reality of demoniacal possessions.

Such hesitancy of faith, such an unwarranted concession to the enemy is as unphilosophical as it is unbiblical. The order of arrangement of the four Gospels is logical no less than historical. First the person of the Son of Man, then His discourses. First His wonderful deeds, then His wonderful words. Rightly judged the three synoptists condition the Fourth Gospel. All move on the same high divine-human plane; but if there be any difference Matthew, Mark and Luke are, objectively considered, more profound and of richer import. Instead of feeling any need of apologizing for the numerous miracles recorded by the Synoptists, or of investing the record with more credibility by referring demoniacal possessions to the superstition of the age, a sound Christology ought to rely on the truth of the principle that the miracles answer to the personality of the Man. The Man who has a consciousness of possessing godlike life and transcendent authority, who has the amazing courage to lay claim to a dignity superior to all other men, such dignity as the inimitable discourses recorded by John necessarily presuppose, must either be unworthy of confidence and respect, or He must have had the will and the power to perform the miracles reported by the Synoptists. Accept the reality of the miracles of Mark, and there is a logical basis for the discourses of John. Deny the miracles of Mark and the legitimate reflex action of thought will deny the extraordinary personality of Jesus. Deny His extraordinary personality, and the discourses of John will have to be resolved into the vagaries of a morbid phantasy.

To state the same principle in other words: if no mighty deeds had been recorded by the Synoptists, if the ills of the

kingdom of darkness had not receded at His touch, if the incarnate Presence of God in ideal manhood had not provoked an unprecedented manifestation of demoniacal enmity, there would have been a contradiction between His words and His doings, between His self-exaltation in speech and His helpless inefficiency in practice.

For the sake of the argument I have impliedly been acceding to the presumption that the teaching of Christ as represented in John differs in kind from His teaching as reported by the Synoptists. But truth requires Christology to challenge this presumption. Is it valid? There is good reason to question its validity. The subject matter of the teaching is the same in all the Gospels. The variation is seen in the method. In John there is little or no teaching by parables; instead we have metaphor; in the other Gospels parables abound. Two methods of teaching represent different aspects of our Lord's genius. The parables of the Synoptists declare His artistic skill, whilst the discourses of John show His philosophic wealth.

Parables are works of art, the word-paintings of the ideal Artist. The subjects are Himself and His kingdom. The classic pictures of Matthew, Mark and Luke, like the noblest works of all great artists, are a perpetual inspiration to the heart of the Christian, and to the scholarly theologian objects of study from age to age.

By deeds and by words, by miracle and by parable Jesus Christ imparts to receptive souls of the fulness of His life and salvation. Men become rich, strong, godlike, and triumph over evil in proportion that by the obedience of faith they accept and appropriate His ministrations.

II.

CALVIN AT HOME.

BY REV. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

CALVIN expresses his views on marriage in his comments on Ephesians 5 : 28–33. “It is a thing against nature,” he remarks, “that any one should not love his wife, for God has ordained marriage in order that two may be made one person—a result which, certainly, no other alliance can bring about. When Moses says that a man shall leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife, he shows that a man ought to prefer marriage to every other union, as being the holiest of all.”

He himself was in no hurry to get married, and put it off till he was over thirty. He rather boasted that people could not charge him with having assailed Rome, as the Greeks besieged Troy, for the sake of a woman. What led him first to think of it, was the sense of loneliness and the need of proper care, that he might be able the better to serve the Church. While living at Strassburg, between 1539 and 1541, he had a housekeeper, with her son, a woman of violent temper who sorely tried his patience. At one time she abused his brother so violently that he left the house, and then she ran away, leaving her son behind. The disturbance made him sick.

He was often urged by his friend Farel (who himself found no time to think of marrying till his old age,) and by Bucer at Strassburg, to take a wife that he might enjoy the comforts of a well-ordered home. He first mentions the subject in a letter to Farel, from Strassburg, May 19, 1539, in which he says: “I am none of those insane lovers who, when once smitten with the fine figure of a woman, embrace also her faults. This only is

the beauty which allures me, if she is chaste, obliging, not fastidious, economical, patient, and careful for my health. Therefore, if you think well of it, set out immediately, lest some one else [Bucer?] gets the start of you. But if you think otherwise, we will let it pass." It seems Farel could not find a person that combined all these qualities, and the matter was dropped for several months.

In Feb. 6, 1540, Calvin, in a letter to the same friend, touched again upon the subject of matrimony, but only incidentally, as if it were a subordinate matter. After informing him about his trouble with Caroli, his discussion with Hermann, the Anabaptist, the good understanding of Charles V. and Francis I., and the alarm of the Protestant princes of Germany, he goes on to say: "Nevertheless, in the midst of such commotions as these, I am so much at my ease as to have the audacity to think of taking a wife. A certain damsel of noble rank has been proposed to me, and with a fortune above my condition. Two considerations deterred me from that connection—because she did not understand our language, and because I feared she might be too mindful of her family and education." *

He sent his brother for another lady, who was highly recommended to him. He expected to get married March 10, and invited Farel to celebrate the wedding. But this project also failed, and he thought of abandoning all further attempts.

At last he married a member of his congregation, at Strassburg, Idelette de Bure, the widow of Jean Stordeur (or Storder) of Liège, a prominent Anabaptist whom he had converted to the orthodox faith, and who had died of the pestilence in the previous February. She was probably the daughter of Lambert de Bure who, with his fellow-citizens, had been deprived of his property and banished forever, after having been legally convicted of heresy in 1533. She was the mother of several children, poor, and in feeble health. She lived in retirement, devoted to the education of her children, and enjoyed the esteem of her friends, for her good qualities of head and heart. Calvin visited her frequently

* Herminjard, VI. 167 sq.



as pastor, and was attracted by her quiet, modest, gentle character. He found in her what he desired—firm faith, devoted love and domestic helpfulness. He calls her “the excellent companion of my life,” “the ever-faithful assistant of my ministry,” and a “rare woman.” Beza calls her “a grave and honorable lady.”

Calvin lived in happy wedlock, but only for nine years. His wife was taken from him at Geneva, after a protracted illness, early in April, 1549. He felt the loss very deeply, and found comfort only in his work. He turned from the coffin to his study-table, and resumed the duties of his office with quiet resignation and conscientious fidelity as if nothing had happened. He remained a widower the remaining fifteen years of his life.

We know much less of Calvin's domestic life than of Luther's. He was always reticent concerning himself and his private affairs, while Luther was very frank and demonstrative. In selecting their wives neither of the Reformers had any regard to the charms of beauty and wealth which attract most lovers, nor even to intellectual endowment; they looked only to moral worth and domestic virtue. Luther married at the age of forty-one, Calvin at the age of thirty-one. Luther married a Catholic ex-nun, after having vainly recommended her to his friend Amsdorf, whom she proudly refused, looking to higher distinction. He married her under a sudden impulse in the midst of the disturbances of the Peasants' War, to the consternation of his friends, that he might please his father, tease the pope, and vex the devil. Calvin married, like Zwingli, a Protestant widow with several children; he married from esteem rather than impulse, after due reflection and the solicitation of friends.

Kathe Luther cuts a prominent figure in her husband's personal history and correspondence, and survived him several years, which she spent in poverty and affliction.

Idelette de Bure lived in modest retirement, and died in peace fifteen years before Calvin. Luther submitted as “a willing servant” to the rule of his “Lord Kathe,” but loved

His letters were written with the simplicity, and the force of his own nature, and expressed his estimate of domestic happiness in the following sentence: "The greatest gift of God to man is a home and a God-fearing, domestic wife."

Henry's domestic life was enlivened by quaint humor, poetry, and song. Henry was never once troubled by the fear of God, and regulated by a sense of duty, but none the less happy. Nothing can be more striking than the charge that Calvin was cold and mathematical. His whole correspondence gives the reverse. His letters on the death of his wife to his daughter-in-law were a study in tenderness and affection.

To Sarah in Venice April 2, 1541 —

"Intelligence of my wife's death has perhaps reached you before now. I do wish I had a better method than being overwhelmed with grief. My friends and those dwelling around me have abundantly shared in my mental suffering. When your letter last week was in my possession. When the brethren were assembled on Tuesday they thought it best that we should join together in prayer. This was done. When asked in the name of the rest, exhorted her to be patient and steady. (She was now greatly worn) stated her faith in God. I afterwards added an exhortation which seemed to me appropriate to the occasion. And though she had made no allusion to her children, I feeling that perhaps by God's will she might be feeling an anxiety concerning them which would make her greater suffering than the disease itself, declared in the presence of the brethren that I should henceforth care for them as if they were my own. Not replied. I have already committed them to the Lord. When I replied that that was not to hinder me from doing my duty, she immediately answered: "If the Lord shall care for them, I know they will be committed to you." Her magnanimity was so great, that she seemed to have already left the world. About the sixth hour of the day on which she yielded up her soul to the Lord, our brother Bourgenin addressed some pious words to her, and while he was doing so, she spoke aloud, so that all saw that her heart was raised far above the world. For these were her words: "O glorious resurrection! O God of Abraham and of all our fathers, in thee have the faithful trusted during so many past ages, and none of them have trusted in vain. I also will hope." These short sentences were rather ejaculated than distinctly spoken. This did not come from the suggestion of others, but from her own reflections, so that she made it obvious in few words what were her own meditations. I had to go out at six o'clock. Having been removed to another apartment after seven, she immediately began to decline.



When she felt her voice suddenly failing her, she said, 'Let us pray; let us pray. All pray for me.' I had now returned. She was unable to speak, and her mind seemed to be troubled. I, having spoken a few words about the love of Christ, the hope of eternal life, concerning our married life, and her departure, engaged in prayer. In full possession of her mind, she both heard the prayer and attended to it. Before eight she expired, so calmly that those present could scarcely distinguish between her life and her death. I at present control my sorrow, so that my duties may not be interfered with. But in the meanwhile the Lord has sent other trials upon me. Adieu, brother and very excellent friend. May the Lord Jesus strengthen you by His Spirit; and may He support me also under this heavy affliction, which would certainly have overcome me, had not He, who raises up the prostrate, strengthens the weak, and refreshes the weary, stretched forth His hand from heaven to me. Salute all the brethren and your whole family."

To Viret he wrote a few days later, April 7, 1549, as follows :

"Although the death of my wife has been exceedingly painful to me, yet I subdue my grief as well as I can. Friends also are earnest in their duty to me. It might be wished, indeed, that they could profit me and themselves more; yet one can scarcely say how much I am supported by their attentions. But you know well enough how tender, or rather soft, my mind is. Had not a powerful self-control, therefore, been vouchsafed to me, I could not have borne up so long. And truly mine is no common source of grief. I have been bereaved of *the best companion of my life*, of one who, had it been so ordered, would not only have been the willing sharer of my indigence, but even of my death. During her life she was *the faithful helper of my ministry*. From her I never experienced the slightest hindrance. She was never troublesome to me throughout the entire course of her illness; she was more anxious about her children than about herself. As I feared these private cares might annoy her to no purpose, I took occasion, on the third day before her death, to mention that I would not fail in discharging my duty to her children. Taking up the matter immediately, she said, 'I have already committed them to God.' When I said that that was not to prevent me from caring for them, she replied, 'I know you will not neglect what you know has been committed to God.' Lately, also, when a certain woman insisted that she should talk with me regarding these matters, I, for the first time, heard her give the following brief answer: 'Assuredly the principal thing is that they live a pious and holy life. My husband is not to be urged to instruct them in religious knowledge and in the fear of God. If they be pious, I am sure he will gladly be a father to them; but if not, they do not deserve that I should ask for aught in their behalf.' This nobleness of mind will weigh more with me than a hundred commendations. Many thanks for your friendly consolation. Adieu, most excellent and honest brother. May the Lord Jesus watch over and direct yourself and your wife. Present my best wishes to her and to the brethren."

In reply to this letter, Viret wrote to Calvin, April 10, 1549 :

"Wonderfully and incredibly have I been refreshed, not by empty rumors alone, but especially by numerous messengers who have informed me how you, with a heart so broken and lacerated, have attended to all your duties, even better than hitherto, . . . and that, above all, at a time when grief was so fresh, and on that account all the more severe, might have prostrated your mind. Go on then as you have begun, . . . and I pray God most earnestly that you may be enabled to do so, and that you may receive daily greater comfort, and be strengthened more and more."

Calvin's character shines in the same favorable light at the loss of his son, who died in infancy (1542). He thanked Viret and his wife (he always sends greetings to Viret's wife and daughter) for their tender sympathy with him in this bereavement, stating that Idelette would write herself also, but for her grief. "The Lord," he says, "has dealt us a severe blow in taking from us our son; but it is our Father who knows what is best for His children." * He found compensation for his want of offspring in the multitude of his spiritual children. "God has given me a little son, and taken him away, but I have myriads of children in the whole Christian world."

How deeply Calvin sympathized with his friends in domestic affliction, we have a most striking testimony in a private letter which was never intended for publication. It is the best proof of his extraordinary fidelity as a pastor. While he was in attendance at the Colloquy and Diet in Ratisbon, as a delegate from Strassbourg, the pestilence carried away, among other friends, Louis de Richebourg, who, together with his older brother, Claude, lived in his house at Strassburg as a student and *pensionnaire*, under the tutorship of Claude Féray, Calvin's dearly beloved assistant. On hearing the sad intelligence, early in April, 1541, he wrote to his father—a gentleman from Normandy, probably the lord of the village de Richebourg, between Rouen and Beauvais, but otherwise un-

* Aug. 19, 1542, at the close. *Opera*, XI., 430.

known to us—a long letter of condolence and comfort, from which we give the following extracts : * —

“RATISBON, (Month of April,) 1541.

“When I first received the intelligence of the death of Claude, and of your son Louis, I was so utterly overpowered (*tout esperdu et confus en mon esprit*) that for many days I was fit for nothing but to weep; and although I was somehow upheld before the Lord by those aids wherewith He sustains our souls in affliction among men, however, I was almost a nonentity; so far at least as regards my discharge of duty, I appeared to myself quite as unfit for it as if I had been half dead (*un homme demi-mort*). On the one hand, I was sadly grieved that a most excellent and faithful friend [Claude Féray] had been snatched away from me—a friend with whom I was so familiar, that none could be more closely united than we were; on the other hand, there arose another cause of grief, when I saw the young man, your son, taken away in the very flower of his age, a youth of most excellent promise, whom I loved as a son, because, on his part, he showed that respectful affection towards me as he would to another father.

“To this grievous sorrow was still added the heavy and distressing anxiety we experienced about those whom the Lord had spared to us. I heard that the whole household were scattered here and there. The danger of Malherbe caused me very great misery, as well as the cause of it, and warned me also as to the rest. I considered that it could not be otherwise but that my wife must be very much dismayed. Your Charles,† I assure you, was continually recurring to my thoughts; for in proportion as he was endowed with that goodness of disposition which had always appeared in him towards his brother, as well as his preceptor, it never occurred to me to doubt but that he would be steeped in sorrow and soaked in tears. One single consideration somewhat relieved me, that he had my brother along with him, who, I hoped, would prove no small comfort in this calamity; even that, however, I could not reckon upon, when, at the same time, I recollected that both were in jeopardy, and neither of them were yet beyond the reach of danger. Thus, until the letter arrived which informed me that Malherbe was out of danger, and that Charles, my brother, wife, and the others were safe, I would have been all but utterly cast down, unless, as I have already mentioned, my heart was refreshed in prayer and private meditations, which are suggested by His Word . . .

“The son whom the Lord had lent you for a season He has taken away.


*The letter was written in French and translated into Latin by Beza in his edition of *Calvini Epistolæ*, Geneva, 1575, p. 280 (under the wrong date of 1540). See *Opera*, XI. 188 sqq.; Herminjard, VII. 66–73; Bonnet-Constable, I. 222–229. I have used Constable’s translation after comparing it with the French original. The concluding part, however, is only extant in Beza’s Latin version.

† The older son of M. de Richebourg.

There is no ground, therefore, for those silly and wicked complaints of foolish men: O blind death! O hard fate! O implacable daughters of Destiny! O cruel fortune! The Lord who had lodged him here for a season, at this stage of his career has called him away. What the Lord has done, we must, at the same time, consider has not been done rashly, nor by chance, neither from having been impelled from without, but by that determinate counsel, whereby He not only foresees, decrees, and executes nothing but what is just and upright in itself, but also nothing but what is good and wholesome for us. Where justice and good judgment reign paramount, where it is impious to remonstrate, when, however, our advantage is bound up in that goodness, how great would be the degree of ingratitude not to acquiesce, with a calm and well-ordered temper of mind, in whatever is the wish of our Father . . .

"It is God who has sought back from you your son, whom He had committed to you to be educated, on the condition that he might always be His own. And, therefore, He took him away because it was both of advantage to him to leave this world, and by this bereavement to humble you, or to make trial of your patience. If you do not understand the advantage of this, without delay, first of all, setting aside every other object of consideration, ask of God that He may show you. Should it be His will to exercise you still farther, by concealing it from you, submit to that will, that you may become wiser than the weakness of thine own understanding can ever attain to. In what regards your son, if you bethink yourself how difficult it is, in this most deplorable age, to maintain an upright course through life, you will judge him to be blessed, who, before encountering so many coming dangers which already were hovering over him, and to be encountered in his day and generation, was so early delivered from them all. He is like one who has set sail upon a stormy and tempestuous sea, and before he has been carried out into the deeps, gets in safety to the secure haven. Nor, indeed, is long life to be reckoned so great a benefit of God, that we can lose anything, when separated only for the space of a few years, we are introduced to a life which is far better. Now, certainly, because the Lord Himself, who is the Father of us all, had willed that Louis should be put among the children as a son of His adoption, He bestows this benefit upon you, out of the multitude of His mercies, that you might reap the excellent fruit of your careful education before his death; whence also you might know your interest in the blessings that belonged to you, 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.'

"From his earliest boyhood, so far as his years allowed, Louis was grounded in the best studies, and had already made such a competent proficiency and progress, that we entertained great hope of him for the future. His manners and behavior had met with the approval of all good men. If at any time he fell into error, he not only patiently suffered the word of admonition, but also that of reproof, and proved himself teachable and obedient, and willing to hearken to advice . . . That, however, which we rate most highly in him was, that he had imbibed so largely the principles of piety, that he had not merely



a correct and true understanding of religion, but had also been faithfully imbued with the unfeigned fear and reverence of God.

"This exceeding kindness of God toward your offspring ought with good reason to prevail more effectually with you in soothing the bitterness of death, than death itself have power to inflict grief upon you.

"With reference to my own feelings, if your sons had never come hither at all, I should never have been grieved on account of the death of Claude and Louis. Never, however, shall this most crushing sorrow, which I suffer on account of both, so overcome me, as to reflect with grief upon that day on which they were driven hither by the hand of God to us, rather than led by any settled purpose of their own, when that friendship commenced which has not only continued undiminished to the last, but which, from day to day, was rather increased and confirmed. Whatever, therefore, may have been the kind or model of education they were in search of, I rejoice that they lived under the same roof with me. And since it was appointed them to die, I rejoice also that they died under my roof, where they rendered back their souls to God more composedly, and in greater circumstance of quiet, than if they had happened to die in those places where they would have experienced greater annoyance from the importunity of those by whom they ought to have been assisted, than from death itself. On the contrary, it was in the midst of pious exhortations, and while calling upon the name of the Lord, that these sainted spirits fled from the communion of their brethren here to the bosom of Christ. Nor would I desire now to be free from all sorrow at the cost of never having known them. Their memory will ever be sacred to me to the end of my days, and I am persuaded that it will also be sweet and comforting.

"But what advantage, you will say, is it to me to have had a son of so much promise, since he has been torn away from me in the first flower of his youth? As if, forsooth, Christ had not merited, by His death, the supreme dominion over the living and the dead! And if we belong to Him (as we ought), why may He not exercise over us the power of life and of death? However brief, therefore, either in your opinion or in mine, the life of your son may have been, it ought to satisfy us that he has finished the course which the Lord had marked out for him.

"Moreover, we may not reckon him to have perished in the flower of his age, who had grown ripe in the sight of the Lord. For I consider all to have arrived at maturity who are summoned away by death; unless, perhaps, one would contend with Him, as if He can snatch away any one before his time. This, indeed, holds true of every one; but in regard to Louis, it is yet more certain on another and more peculiar ground. For he had arrived at that age, when, by true evidence, he could prove himself a member of the body of Christ: having put forth this fruit, he was taken from us and transplanted. Yes, instead of this transient and vanishing shadow of life, he has regained the real immortality of being.

"Nor can you consider yourself to have lost him, whom you will recover in the blessed resurrection in the kingdom of God. For they had both so lived

and so died that I cannot doubt but they are now with the Lord. Let us, therefore, press forward toward this goal which they have reached. There can be no doubt but that Christ will bind together both them and us in the same inseparable society, in that incomparable participation of His own glory. Beware, therefore, that you do not lament your son as lost, whom you acknowledge to be preserved by the Lord, that he may remain yours forever, who, at the pleasure of His own will, lends him to you only for a season . . .

"Neither do I insist upon your laying aside all grief. Nor, in the school of Christ, do we learn any such philosophy as requires us to put off that common humanity with which God has endowed us, that, being men, we should be turned into stones. These considerations reach only so far as this, that you do set bounds, and, as it were, temper even your most reasonable sadness; that, having shed those tears which were due to nature and to fatherly affection, you by no means give way to senseless wailing. Nor do I by any means interfere because I am distrustful of your prudence, firmness, or high-mindedness; but only lest I might here be wanting, and come short in my duty to you.

"Moreover, I have requested Melancthon and Bucer that they would also add their letters to mine, because I entertained the hope that it would not be unacceptable that they too should afford some evidence of their good-will toward you.

"Adieu, most distinguished sir, and my much-respected in the Lord. May Christ the Lord keep you and your family, and direct you all with His own Spirit, until you may arrive where Louis and Claude have gone before."

III.

DID CHRIST SUFFER IN HIS DIVINE NATURE?

BY REV. CORNELIUS R. LANE, D.D., PH.D.

ACCORDING to the Scriptures, the Work of Redemption is God's greatest work. It makes manifest as much power and wisdom as the Work of Creation, and more goodness, that is, love more abounding and more intense, sterner justice and such condescension and forbearance as are simply impossible in a system in which no sin is found.

Of this greatest divine work, we, in common with all intelligent creatures, ought to learn all that can be known; and as distinguished from all others, we ought to study it more than they, because we are the direct objects of the benefits which the work confers.

But upon the very threshold of the investigation we are met by an inscrutable mystery, the doctrine of the Incarnation.

This doctrine is a mystery, not merely as a secret unknown until revealed; but also in the sense that the fact itself, when revealed, is beyond the power of any creature to understand. It must therefore be received on the ground of testimony external to the fact itself and apart from the nature of the thing in itself considered. All that can be done therefore is to consider, on the one hand, what the Scriptures teach as to what the doctrine is; and on the other, what relations, Scriptural and rational, it sustains to the scheme of Redemption.

One of these relations, it is proposed to examine, namely, the sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of David, in satisfaction of the claims of the Divine Law binding on sinners of our race. In order to definiteness of discussion,

this will be done by way of considering and attempting to answer the question :

Did the Lord Jesus Christ suffer as to His Divine nature in and as a part of that offering which He made of Himself for our sins?

As preliminary to the discussion of the specific points presented, and in some measure to prepare the way for it, it is to be remarked in the first place and in general, that the passibility of the Divine nature is improbable for the reason,

I. That it is opposed to all our conceptions of God as a perfect being—perfect, that is, not merely in kind, as the elect angels are perfect, but absolutely, without possibility either of improvement or of deterioration.


1st. God, viewed in contrast with creatures, is perfect as to time, that is, He is eternal. With Him there is no past and no future; but all is what we call present. With Him therefore there can be no waiting, that is, no longing for any future good and no dread of any future evil.

2d. As to place, that is, as to what we call place, God is everywhere in the same sense at the same time, that is, God is immense, and therefore, with Him, there is no motion, no going or coming to or from one place to another. Anything, therefore, that affects us painfully or even unpleasantly in the way of desire for the presence of persons or things absent can have no place with Him. As to God, therefore, from the source of locality there can be no suffering.

3d. God is perfect as to knowledge, that is, He is omniscient. He can, therefore, make no mistakes, and therefore He can feel no regret for anything He has done or omitted in what as to us is the past, and entertain no uncertainty or apprehension as to the future.

4th. God's power is perfect; it inheres in an efficient will and therefore its exercise is independent of the use of means; and therefore externally it is irresistible, and limited internally only by His own good pleasure.

This attribute, therefore, takes away the ground of everything



painful viewed as arising from any danger of failure in accomplishing His purposes.

5th. God is just—righteous in all His ways; and therefore upon a review, as men say, of what He has done, there can be no self-condemnation.

These specifications are enough, on the one hand, to show that it is highly improbable that a perfect can be in any way a suffering being. They show, as far as the facts known can show, that God, speaking after the way of human analogy, is secured as to His blessedness and defended from every possible form of dissatisfaction with Himself or with anything He has done.

On the other hand, the very same considerations also exclude from the Divine mind all those affections pertaining to creatures, which are painful in their nature, yet beneficial in their tendency; the pain of amputation, for example, which is gladly endured in order to preserve life.


In all such cases, the suffering is in order to a greater good. But God has every good He can have. As to Him, therefore, there can be no improvement either in His nature, His condition or His circumstances.

If, at this point, the existence of sin is suggested as an objection, it is allowable also to suggest that the existence of sin, viewed as a source of misery, presses with equal weight upon the Divine benevolence, which delights in the happiness of creatures, and upon the Divine power, which could have prevented the existence of sin. For if God could not have prevented the existence of sin, then, being benevolent on the one hand, and being, on the other, by the supposition imperfect as to His power, at least in the sense of defective, God must be miserable in contemplating the misery which He could not prevent; and both He and we may well be apprehensive lest all His promises come to naught. For if the Divine power is such that, in spite of it, sin has entered in once, it is certainly possible for it to enter again and again, and for Deluge after Deluge of sin and misery to devastate God's Universe as the cycles of everlasting ages roll on.

II. If God can suffer, He must be miserable, at least, in the way of apprehension. If He does suffer, He is miserable; and if miserable to any extent, He can be to the greatest possible extent, miserable not occasionally, for He does not live in time, but miserable always and unchangeably, for He is Eternal; miserable in proportion to His infinite goodness manifested in Nature by His benevolence and in Redemption by His grace, that is, if God can be miserable to any degree, He can be, and as far as finite knowledge can discern, He must be miserable to an infinite degree. God's very greatness, therefore, is a source of greater misery, unless it be so great that it excludes all misery, on the one hand, and on the other, secures all blessedness. God, therefore, must be to His intelligent creatures either an object of unbounded confidence or a being to be commiserated. Between these extremes there does not appear to be any resting-place.

III. The language of the Scriptures, which attributes to God grief, Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, Ps. 95: 10, and repentance, Gen. 6: 5-7, must be interpreted in some way that is consistent with the Divine perfections as presented in other passages; and, if this cannot be done, then the Scriptures teach that God is local; Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, Gen. 4: 16, and consequently moves from place to place. The Lord went his way, Gen. 18: 33, ignorant, Ps. 14: 2, uncertain, Ex. 13: 17, and perplexed, What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it? Isa. 5: 4.

But the conclusion that God is local, ignorant, uncertain and perplexed cannot be admitted, unless His Omnipresence, Omniscience and Eternity be denied; for He cannot be both Omnipresent and local, Omniscient and ignorant, Eternal and yet waiting on the acts of His creatures to determine the course of His own conduct: but any principle of interpretation which involves a contradiction within the limits of our knowledge must be given up; or the Scriptures themselves as claiming to be a Divine revelation must be rejected.



These general remarks in regard to God as He is revealed to us in ourselves, in external Nature and in the Scriptures have, it is hoped, somewhat prepared the way for the examination, in the Second place, of the particular point proposed, namely, Did the Lord Jesus Christ suffer as to His Divine nature in and as a part of that offering which He made of Himself as a satisfaction to Divine justice for our sins?

Answering this Question in the negative, the First (I.) argument is that the proposition, The Lord Jesus Christ did suffer in His Divine nature in and as a part of His work of Redemption is unscriptural.

For, 1st. It is not necessary to a consistent interpretation of what the Scriptures teach in regard to the work of Christ.

Here it must be admitted that the Scriptures use language in regard to Christ which, at first sight, appears to be confused and even contradictory. He is spoken of as a child and at the same time as the mighty God; as the Creator and Preserver of all things and yet hungry, weary, houseless; as dying through weakness and yet at the same time the Object of that faith which secures everlasting life.

After long and sharp controversy, the Church has settled down into the belief, not likely to be disturbed, that the Lord Jesus Christ, being the Eternal Son of God, became man by taking to Himself a true, that is, a real body and a reasonable soul; and that He is and will continue to be both God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever: and, that all apparent confusion and contradiction can be removed and is in fact removed upon the principle, that, Whatever may be affirmed of either nature of the Lord Jesus Christ, may be affirmed of the whole person regardless of the aspect from which the person is designated. Hence we may say, The Son of God was made under the law, for it is true of Christ's human nature; and that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sin, for it is true of His Divine nature: and also that the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost, which is not true of either nature taken separately, but is true of both united.

This principle of Interpretation, if it be admitted takes away all necessity for holding that the Divine nature suffered; and if it be rejected, then it must indeed be admitted.

2d. That the Scriptures teach the suffering of the Divine nature, when they say, The Lord of glory was crucified; and then they also teach


(1) That the Son of God is a dependent being: I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear I judge, and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which has sent me.

I can of mine own self do nothing—I, the whole person, whatever were its properties, relations or prerogatives, the entity then speaking, is inherently powerless; depends on hearing for information; and judges justly, not by that certainty which comes of Omniscience but because He is without selfish bias as to the will of the Father who sent Him.

(2) Upon this supposition, the Scriptures teach that the Son, taken absolutely without regard to the distinction of Son of God and Son of David—the Son did not know when the events foretold by Himself as certain would become actual. For the time was known neither to men, nor to angels, nor to the Son, but to the Father only. Here is ignorance both actual and confessed.

(3) If the Scriptures teach that the Divine nature of Christ suffered; then they also teach that His human nature was deified. For (a) when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. Here either the Son of man is Divine; or, a creature is exercising Divine prerogatives by performing a Divine work.

(b) It is admitted on both sides that the Son of David is also the Son of God, that is, according to the principle of Interpretation already referred to, the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of David according to the flesh and the Son of God as to His Divine nature: or, this principle being denied, then the Son of David



is the Son of God, and on the other hand, equally the Son of God is the Son of David, that is, in the one case, the human nature has become Divine; and in the other, the Divine nature has become human; and that not by way of the inter-communication of attributes, but by way of formal and complete transmutation.

These considerations appear to reduce the proposition that the Divine nature of our Lord suffered to an absurdity. For, if the Canon of Interpretation adopted by all who hold the real humanity and supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only persons who have any interest in this discussion, be admitted, the argument proves too little, for each class of affirmations can be referred to its proper subject; and if it be rejected, the argument proves too much; for it proves that between the finite and the infinite, the human and the Divine, there is really no essential difference; for each nature not only by possibility can, but each nature has in fact become the other!

(4) Equally strong as an argument, and perhaps more convincing on account of our greater knowledge is the fact that if the Scriptures teach that the Divine nature suffered; then they also teach and for the same reason, that, Christ in His Divine nature obeyed the Law binding on us. But such obedience is simply impossible; for God cannot have another God before Him, and He cannot observe the Sabbath as we are bound to observe it, namely, as a means of spiritual improvement; nor can He break the Sabbath as we can break it by labor, for in Him labor does not produce weariness, and therefore rest as refreshment is not needed; nor can God covet what belongs to others, for He Himself is the possessor of all things and He need not covet, for as a being perfect in knowledge and power His resources are as boundless as His desires.

The Scriptures, therefore, do not teach that the Lord Jesus Christ suffered in His Divine nature, but they teach precisely the opposite in all they reveal of God as an infinitely perfect being; perfect not as creatures are, of their kind, but absolutely; supreme without a rival, in all places without motion,

efficient without exertion and blessed beyond peradventure of change.

II. The second general argument is derived from a detailed examination of the case to be provided for, in the light both of reason and revelation.

This requires us to consider our first parents in the estate in which they were created, namely, as perfect after their kind; in reference to the special Providential arrangement made with them, and as in a state of condemnation.

1st. Our first parents and all creatures are (1) liable to fall from the estate in which they were created, for the simple reason that they are creatures. Therefore, while continued obedience strengthens virtuous principles and therefore makes it less and less likely that sin will be committed; yet no obedience however long continued can make it certain that creatures will not fall into sin for the reason that they are by the very condition of their existence liable to change.

(2). The Law of God relative to creatures of the same kind is, as a rule of duty, the same at all times, the present, past and future, and in all places, heaven, earth and hell; and its obligation is perfect and perpetual, and independent of ability to keep it or inability.

(3). If a creature is simply under law and incurs its penalty, then, as far as we know either from the nature of the case or from anything God has revealed, his redemption from that penalty is simply impossible. For the claims of the law are both perfect and perpetual, and therefore the time can never come when the Law has no further claims, and when as a consequence, release can be demanded as a matter of right.

2d. In regard to the special arrangement made with the first Adam, commonly called the Covenant of Works, it is to be remarked first, (1) that if this transaction meant anything, it meant that Adam was placed by an act of Divine condescension under a Covenant in order to his confirmation in life, that is, for perpetual completeness as he then was. This was his greatest good, and as to it, he was put upon probation

in order to secure, by his own obedience, this greatest of all blessings.

(2) In the next place it must be remembered that the claims of a Covenant and of a Law, while they are alike in that they both require perfect obedience, are different in that the claims of a Covenant are, in the nature of the case, limited as to time; just as the claims of a Law, from the very nature of law, are unlimited. From the claims of Law, therefore, as law, in the reason of the thing, there can be no deliverance; but from the claims of a Covenant, because it is a covenant, deliverance is possible, and in the case of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, it has become actual.

3d. When men are viewed as fallen and the subject of their restoration is proposed, then we know certainly that the claims of the Covenant of Works, which contains as an essential element the Law as a Rule of Duty, cannot be changed. These claims, therefore, must be met both as to precept and penalty in order to deliverance from them.

In order to meet the claim for penalty, the first proposition is, that the suffering of the Lord Jesus Christ as to His Divine nature, that is, infinite suffering, is unnecessary.

For first, we know certainly that the claim for obedience was a definite, finite thing for a definite time; such a claim, according to reason and the Scriptures, as the first Adam could fully meet. If, therefore, the claim was finite, it is hard to see how the penalty could be infinite in any other sense than that of indefinitely great, that is, ever increasing as to its intensity and endless as to the matter of time.

2d. If the penalty was infinite in any other sense than that of indefinitely great, it could not be inflicted. For it will always be true that the suffering endured at any given time is less than that to be endured at any succeeding period; and therefore in any particular case at any given time, it could be greater than it is, and therefore greater as a whole. The actual penalty, therefore, which neither falls short of nor goes beyond the just desert of sin, is not and never can be so great that it

can be no greater. But infinity taken in this sense is not infinity as God is infinite, nor does it even tend in that direction.

3d. If the Lord Jesus Christ did in fact suffer as to His Divine nature, then of course He could so suffer; and if He could suffer as Divine, then as Divine He could obey; and if as Divine He could both suffer and obey; then also He did not need a human soul either to suffer or obey, for no finite being can add value or efficacy to a work of an infinite being.

The suffering, therefore, of the Divine nature of Christ is certainly not necessary to, even if it be in accordance with the view that He took to Himself both a true body and a reasonable soul.

4th. Another argument is found in the difference universally admitted to exist between pecuniary and criminal satisfaction to legal claims.

In pecuniary matters, value for value, dollar for dollar, is necessary to cancel a claim; a debtor can never cancel a debt in any other way than by paying it in the exact terms of the agreement; and in a just Bankrupt law the Government merely says to the creditor that it has no means of collecting his debt, that is, it cannot perform the impossibility of making one dollar of assets pay two dollars of debt. In this case, therefore, the equivalent must be exact in order to satisfy the claim. But in criminal satisfaction, precise equivalents are generally impossible and perhaps never actual. For example, if a man commit the crime of murder once, twice or a score of times, with the forfeiture of his life the Law is satisfied, because its authority is maintained; and if two men or ten acting in concert slay only a single individual, the Law requires the life not of one of the two or ten, but the lives of all who were concerned in the transaction, for the reason that nothing less will maintain its authority. The claim for obedience, therefore which is definite and measurable, follows the analogy of pecuniary satisfaction; but the claim for suffering, which is in its own nature indefinite, being different in the same individual in

different circumstances, and in different individuals in the same circumstances, and deriving its sacredness and importance not only from the punishment deserved but also from the end to be secured, namely, the existence and well-being of Society; this claim if satisfied at all, must be satisfied in some other way than that of precise equivalents.

Two individuals, therefore, acting in a private capacity, may as between themselves settle their pecuniary accounts, in which only profit and loss are concerned, as they see fit and exchange receipts on such terms as they deem advantageous, for only they themselves are interested in the transaction; but when a public officer is dealing with crime, that is, with the right and wrong of things considered in themselves and in their relation to the State, his first and most important duty is to consider and maintain the interests of the public. When he has done this, then and not before is he at liberty to regard the interest of the criminal; that is, in order to pardon, in any particular case, the first and essential condition is that the law be maintained in all its authority and vigor.

The precise thing to be done, therefore, in order to release from a penalty imposed by a sentence is, not to find an exact equivalent to the penalty, but to find a way in which the claims of justice may be met in the very act of pardon, and the authority and efficiency of the Law as a means of public safety be maintained. In particular, a way must be found to leave the Law unimpaired,—(1) as to its claim to punish transgressors on the ground of the inherent ill-desert of sin, as a crime, not merely as damage; (2) as an object of confidence, that it will protect and defend the obedient; and (3) as a terror to evil-doers.

Whenever these conditions are complied with, the exercise of mercy in way of pardon is both right in itself and just according to the most stringent requirements of Law.

Now, this is precisely what the Lord Jesus Christ has done in the Work of Redemption. For, in order to comply with these conditions, with which no being merely human or only

Divine could comply, He joined our nature to His own in one person, thereby making that human nature the most exalted creature in the Universe; the most exalted in station, for it is the most nearly allied to God; and the most exalted in excellence, for it received the gifts of the Holy Ghost without measure; and it was distinguished from all other creatures of our race, by the fact that it was not, although human, under any obligation natural or legal to obey the Law binding on human beings; and, being thus unmeasurably exalted, He was, by Covenant, made under the Law; and He rendered to the precept precisely what was required of us, namely, a perfect obedience; and to the penalty, by His sufferings and death, all the satisfaction any law can demand or receive,—a satisfaction as complete as the infliction of the whole penalty on every individual of our race could have secured; that is, the satisfaction rendered by our Lord has left the Divine Law in unimpaired integrity and vigor for all the purposes for which any law exists. For, no creature was ever led to doubt the inherent evil nature and ill-desert of sin; no creature was ever led to distrust his safety in obedience; and no creature was ever tempted to commit sin, hoping to escape its punishment, by contemplating the mercy of God exercised on the ground of the satisfaction which the Lord Jesus Christ has rendered to the Divine Law.

This satisfaction, therefore, is all the nature of the case requires, and therefore it is all that is necessary to meet the case; and therefore anything else, more or different, is unnecessary. For, on the ground of it, God can be just in justifying the ungodly; and its moral power, that is, as deterring from sin, is as great as God Himself can make it.

The Second Proposition is,—The Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer as to His Divine nature, because such suffering, if actual, would be valueless as a satisfaction to the law binding on us.

The Law of God, that is, the Rule which expresses the duties creatures owe to their Creator, rests proximately on the Divine will, but ultimately on the Divine nature. It must,

therefore, be in all essential respects the same for all rational creatures, men or angels, good or bad, that is, as far as it expresses what is due from creatures as such, namely, veneration, love, confidence and obedience; and it must also vary in detail according to the specific nature of each class of beings. The angels, for example, are under no obligation to obey parents, or to rest as we do on the Sabbath; nor are human beings, in their present condition, required to be always active in the service of God, for by our present constitution, we need rest in the unconscious state of sleep.

Now the Law, which requires satisfaction in order to the salvation of human beings, is that which prescribes the essential duties of creatures in general, modified by the special nature of man. Any obedience, therefore, or suffering other than human, whether it be angelic or Divine, is of no value as a satisfaction to the law binding on us; for the reason, that it is not what the law requires of us: just as, on the one hand, no amount of suffering can avail to satisfy a pecuniary claim; nor, on the other, can any amount of money avail to satisfy for a crime; because, in neither case, is the thing offered the thing demanded. Hence, again, the necessity that the Son of God become incarnate, in order that He might, as human, render such a satisfaction, in matter and form, as the Law demanded of us. Such a satisfaction Christ did render, and therefore His work is valuable to us; but it is of no redemptive value to the angels that sinned, because it is not what the law they are under demands of them.

Divine suffering, therefore, even if actual, would be valueless to us or to any other order of sinful beings, because it is not what the law binding on creatures demands; and therefore it cannot be of the nature of a satisfaction to those demands.

Proposition third: Whether Divine suffering is possible in itself considered or impossible; yet such Divine suffering as is necessary in order that it may sustain any relation whatever to our redemption from the penalty of the law is simply impossible.

For, the suffering necessary to satisfy a penalty imposed by a

misery is neither a misfortune nor a calamity, for it is specifically deserved. It is not such suffering as naturally arises when we think and by contemplating the misery of others, but it is a misery accidental nor sympathetic, for it is not merely a pain experienced, but a pain inflicted: and, therefore, the existence of the suffering does not depend on the willingness or unwillingness of the sufferer, for the desert of the suffering is not actually ascertained and the punishment judicially imposed: and therefore unavoidable. It is unavoidable as a matter of fact imposed by justice: and also as to any resistance that can be offered, because it is enforced by the omnipotent power of an overruler whose law has been broken. But after suffering as a punishment cannot pertain to a Divine being, because after it is superior in station or in power to inflict it: and yet in the same manner, as suffering not inflicted as punishment, it itself as a reserved punishment for sin can be a means of an expiation: and if it is not an expiation for sin, then it does not in any manner have relation of any sort whatever to redemption from sin.

Therefore, on the one hand, in general, because it is highly probable that the Divine nature can suffer on account of its personal nature: if the Divine nature can suffer at all, it can, and as it is so now, must suffer infinitely, as well as be infinitely happy and blessed, that is, God can be at the same time both infinitely happy and infinitely miserable, that is, He can be infinitely contradictory: because the Scriptures, which ascribe grief and vengeance to God, must be explained in some way that is consistent with what they teach of His perfection, and can be so explained, or else they are self-contradictory within the limits of our knowledge, and therefore false, for no being can be both omnipresent and local, omniscient and ignorant, in any way miserable and yet supremely happy. And, on the other hand, in particular, because the suffering of the Lord Jesus Christ as to His Divine nature is unscriptural in that in the first place such suffering is not necessary to a consistent interpretation of the Scriptures, because each class of predicates can be referred

to its proper subject, and then the argument proves too little; or, if the admission of Divine suffering is necessary, then the argument proves too much; for, on the same principle, the Scriptures also teach that the Son of God, as such, was dependent; that His human nature was deified, and that as Divine He could and did render such obedience as is possible only to creatures; because the case to be provided for, namely, the satisfaction of the Divine law, broken as a covenant, did not require such suffering as only an infinite being can endure, for the reason the claim terminated on a finite being, and therefore in justice it must have been such a claim as a finite being could fully meet; because the Lord Jesus Christ as to His human nature, which is the most exalted creature in the universe and under no obligations of any kind, moral or legal, to obey any law except that of its own nature, was by covenant made under the law binding on us, and by His obedience, His sufferings and His death, He left the law unimpaired in its authority to demand perfect obedience, to punish sin simply as sin, to protect the obedient and as a terror to evil-doers, He rendered to the law all the satisfaction any law can demand or receive; because Divine suffering, if actual, would be valueless as a satisfaction for us in that it is not what the law requires of us; and because compulsory legal suffering as a punishment, which the case demands, is simply impossible to a Divine being:—Therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer as to His Divine nature in and as a part of His work of Redemption.

In view of what has been said, it is certainly excusable to make, by way of concluding this article, a formal statement of the whole doctrine of our Lord's Satisfaction to the Divine Law, as a broken Covenant, demanding both obedience and penalty in order to release from its claims and to confer everlasting life.

1st. Our first father, as created, was, by the very constitution of his nature, under law.

2d. What obedience to the law, as law, could do for him was, on the one hand, to protect him while he continued in obedi-

ence ; and on the other, to strengthen the virtuous principles of his nature and thereby render him less and less likely to fall ; but no obedience, however long continued, could secure him against the danger of falling.

3d. Had the first Adam sinned against mere law, then, as far as we know, either from the nature of the thing, or from anything God has revealed in the Scriptures, deliverance from its penalty would have been simply impossible. For the claims of a law, as law, are perpetual, and therefore the time could never come when release could be demanded as matter of right.

4th. The first Adam was, in fact, placed not merely under law, as to which he was not ; but also under covenant, as to which he was the federal head, that is, the representative of all his posterity in order to his own and their confirmation in life. This blessing, the law, as law, cannot give ; for all the law proposes to do and all it can do, is to protect the obedient and punish the disobedient ; and this blessing, namely, confirmation in life, the law as a covenant can give, for it is of the nature of a covenant, as distinguished from a law, to confer blessings upon the performance of stipulated conditions.

5. When the covenant was violated by sinning, it was by the very act abrogated as a covenant, while it remained in full force and virtue as a law. For no creature can take advantage of his own wrong, that is, he cannot impair obligation by violating it.

Our first father, therefore, having sinned, was perfectly helpless. The right to confirmation in life held out to him in the covenant was forfeited, its penalty was incurred, and his obligation to render perfect obedience to the law, as a rule of duty, remained unimpaired. He could not help himself, and no other creature could help him ; for every creature owes for itself all the obedience possible for it to render, that is, an obedience both perfect and perpetual.

On the other hand the Scriptures teach :

1st. That the Lord Jesus Christ, Himself divine, and who as a divine person neither was nor could become subject to the law

binding on us, took to Himself, not a human person, for a human person would have been of necessity under obligation for itself, but a human nature on which no obligation can terminate, and therefore He was able, as to His human nature, to offer, if He chose, a meritorious, that is, an unowed obedience, and to endure meritorious, that is, undeserved suffering.

2d. The Scriptures teach that the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of David, was made under the Covenant of Works, and that He satisfied all its claims, rendering to the Precept, which is a definite, measurable thing, a perfect obedience, and to the Penalty, which is in its own nature indefinite, and therefore cannot be referred to any exact standard of measurement, such suffering and so much of it as left the law in unimpaired authority and vigor for all the purposes for which any law can or does exist. For, as against its claims the most august creature God ever made, the most excellent in nature, the most exalted in station and the best beloved could not be spared. He could not be saved from the hour He dreaded to meet, nor pass by the cup He was reluctant to drink; and, to crown all, when His body was expiring on the Cross, His human soul was forsaken of the Father. Forsaken of God! The greatest suffering and the highest form of penalty God can inflict or the creature endure!!

Under this pressure, as great as sin itself deserves, the mortal life of our Lord Jesus gave way, and the work of satisfaction was finished.

Here then is a real and a meritorious offering for sin; necessary, the whole of it, to make salvation possible in a single case, for the broken covenant demanded it all; and all that is necessary in any number of cases, or for the salvation of all under the curse (the penalty) of the first covenant; for it is such a satisfaction as maintains the supremacy of the law as the authoritative measure of right and wrong, and as the ground of safety to the obedient and as an object of fear to the disobedient. For, in order to maintain this supremacy, a precise equality in suffering is not only not necessary, but in general not possible, and

in this particular case, not actual, for the Lord Jesus Christ certainly did not suffer as much as all the saved would have suffered throughout everlasting ages.

Therefore, 31, what Christ did in satisfaction of the covenant of works is as sufficient for all without exception, for the whole race, numerous as it is, or if it were ten or ten thousand times more numerous, as it is for the salvation of a single individual; no more, no less; and it is just as suitable for all without distinction. For every sinner of our race needs just this, and no sinner needs anything more or anything different as the ground of his justification before God. The legal difficulty to salvation, therefore, is removed from the way of every sinner of our race by the one satisfaction of Christ, just as certainly and just as fully as the one transgression was the ground of the condemnation of all our race, and would have been, had the number represented by the first Adam been greater than it is or less. For, as on the one hand, one transgression violates the terms of the covenant as really and as fatally as a thousand transgressions; so on the other, the one satisfaction of Christ is necessary to and all that is required for the salvation of one or of all, or any other number, of those who are under the curse of the first covenant. Indeed, the one work of Christ satisfied the Divine law more fully than the perdition of the whole race could satisfy it. For Christ not only suffered the penalty, but He also rendered a perfect obedience to the precept, which the perdition of the whole race could not have secured. It is in Christ, therefore, and only in Christ, that the Divine law, as a rule of duty or as a covenant of life has ever been fulfilled.

The difficulty, therefore, that remains in the way of the salvation of any sinner is a difficulty that arises, not from the satisfaction made to the law in regard to either its sufficiency or its suitableness; but it arises from his sinful nature, which makes a sinner, however willing he may be to escape the punishment due to his sins, unwilling to be saved by grace. But no law can take cognizance of a moral difficulty by way of providing a remedy for it. A moral difficulty, if removed at all,

must be removed by some power external to and independent of the law, or even of the Gospel viewed simply as a system of truth, presenting a way of escape from sin and imposing duties; such, for example, as repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the plan of salvation, this moral difficulty is removed by the Holy Spirit; who, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ and renewing our wills (affections) persuades and enables us to embrace Christ freely offered to us in the Gospel.

Lastly: What other results, in addition to the justification and sanctification of believers, flow from the work of Christ as related to the covenant of redemption in particular, or to the purposes of God in general,—these things, although of the greatest importance to us and of the greatest interest to all intelligent creatures, the question proposed for discussion does not require us to consider.

It may be doubted whether the following Collection of Authorities is worth the trouble of making it, but having been made, it may be worth preserving.

DIVINE PASSIBILITY?

FIRST: DIRECT DENIAL.

I. The Confessions.

1. The Council of Chalcedon; Hammond's Apostolical Canons, pp. 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103, 146.
2. Fidei ratio, Zwingli; Niemeyer, p. 18.
3. Expositio Fidei, Zwingli; Niemeyer, p. 42.
4. Conf. Helvetica posterior, Niemeyer, p. 485.
5. Anglican Conf. of A.D. 1592, Art. I., Niemeyer, p. 592.
6. Compendium, American Ref. Church, Question 33.
7. Form of Concord, Hase, pp. 766, 772.
8. Catechism of Council of Trent, Streitwolf, pp. 149–150.

II. Theologians.

1. Augustine, quoted by De Moor, 21 : 16.
2. Anselmus, *Cur Deus homo*, Book I., Chap. 8.
3. Calvin, *Institutes*, Book 2 : 14 : 2, 3 : 11 : 8.
4. Turretine, 13 : 6 : 21, 14 : 2 : 5 ; *De Sat. Disp.*, 10th Sec., 16, 17.
5. Witsius, *Econ. of the Covenants*, 2 : 4 : 20, 2 : 8 : 3.
6. Marckii *Compendium*, 20 : 19, 21 : 16.
7. De Moor, 19 : 23, 19 : 25 (5, a) 20 : 19, 21 : 16.
8. Grotius, *De Sat.*, Chap. 8 : 16.
9. Stapfer, iii., Sec. 362.
10. Fisher's *Catechism*, Question 21 : 32, 22 : 29.
11. President Edwards, *His. of Redemption*, Period ii., Ch. 1, Part 1.
12. Bretschneider, quoted in *Princeton Theo. Essays*, i., p. 316.
13. Boston, ii., p. 10, 18 ; Dwight, ii., p. 217 ; Watson, ii., p. 135 ;
Hodge, ii., pp. 395, 402, 483 ; Hodge A. A. *Atonement*, pp.
30, 311.

SECONDLY: DENIAL BY WAY OF IMPLICATION.

I. The Confessions.

1. Geneva Cat., Niemeyer, p. 131.
2. Gallic Conf., Art. 14, Niemeyer, p. 333.
3. First Scotch Conf., Sec. 9, Niemeyer, 344.
4. Heidelberg Cat., Questions 16 and 37 ; *Compend.*, Question 33.
5. *Czengerina*, pp. 543, 549, 550.
6. Anhalt, pp. 631, 634-5.
7. Westminster Conf., Chap. 8 : 4 ; Larger Cat., Questions 38, 39.
8. Form of Concord, Hase, p. 608.
9. Cat. of Council of Trent, Streitwolf, p. 138.

II. Theologians.

- Turretine, 13 : 3 : 19 ; 13 : 6 : 21 ; 14 : 10 : 12.
 Vol. iv., Disputation 10th, Sec. 17.
 Vol. iv., Disputation 11th, Sec. 6.
 Stapfer, Vol. i., Sec. 1095.
 Witsius, Lib. ii., 6 : 40.
 Vitringa, quoted by Hodge, iii., 147.
 Geierus, *Lutheran, Disputatio de Sat.*, pp. 757-8, 761, 766.
 Boston, i., p. 91.
 Ridgley, i. p. 404.
 Hodge, A. A. *Outlines*, Chap. 21 : Ques. 2 (?).

IV.

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS OF SCOTLAND AND THEIR NEW SERVICE BOOK.*

BY REV. WILLIAM FREDERICK FABER.

THE announcement that Presbyterians in Scotland had just published a book of written prayers and liturgical services would of itself be received, by the general American reader, with astonishment, if not incredulity; much as if, let us say, some one informed him that His Holiness Leo XIII. had issued an encyclical reinstating Communion in both kinds, or permitting the priesthood to marry. But surprising as the announcement is, we have the proof of its trustworthiness in *A Book of Common Order* which we have seen with our eyes and handled with our hands; of whose growth, up to a sixth edition in 1890, we gave the readers of the REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW an account last October.

When, however, we now add the further information that from the United Presbyterian Church (familiarily known as the "U. P. Church") a Prayer Book has emanated, very few indeed among us, we venture to say, but will regard it as a thing passing strange if true.

For, after all, the "Kirk," whose ministers are so largely enlisted in the liturgical movement referred to, is an *Established Church*; and in established Churches we are wont to look for a certain latitude of opinion and practice; witness the Church of England, and the Church of Prussia. This we may admit, without charging—as did a good Presbyterian elder, in a con-

* *Presbyterian Forms of Service*. Issued by the Devotional Service Association in connection with the United Presbyterian Church. Edinburgh: 1891 pp. vii. 158.

versation with the writer, on the Scotch Liturgy—that ‘established Churches are always worldly, and naturally tend to drift away from simple spirituality!’ A charge like that is always easily made, carries a certain plausibility on the surface of it, and is difficult to answer because in its sweeping generality it may compass some truth; but it is nevertheless a charge which convicts no one and settles nothing, for that is the very question at issue—whether any particular movement is, or is not, an effect or a symptom of worldliness. This real question is brought to the front with new force when, in a quarter antecedently so unlikely, we see the manifestation of the same liturgical spirit; when the United Presbyterians of Scotland also produce a book of written prayers and of liturgical forms.

But before we give more particular account of this publication, it will be well to set ourselves right in regard to the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland itself. Let us at once say that this Church is not, as such, either mother or sister of the United Presbyterian Church in this country. To make this clear, we shall need to recall briefly the history of the two bodies.

In 1733 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland cast out Ebenezer Erskine, and three other ministers who publicly expressed agreement with him, for the offence of rebuking certain corruptions in doctrine and administration; and these men with others who ere long joined them, formed a Presbytery to which they gave the name of “the Associate Presbytery.” From this beginning there grew, through many vicissitudes, the United Secession Church, numbering in 1847 not far from four hundred congregations, and having sixty missionaries in foreign lands.

In 1752 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland issued sentence of deposition against the Rev. Thomas Gillespie for refusing to take part in installing an unworthy minister over an unwilling people. He had been the only one bold enough to maintain his stand, though it appears that his whole Presbytery took the same view of the case that he did. Gillespie gathered a congregation about him, was eventually joined by other min-

isters, and they together formed in 1761 the "Relief Presbytery"—for the "relief" of congregations on whom patronage thrust unworthy ministers. With Erskine this abuse of patronage was but one of several grievances; but with Gillespie, having lost his living because of his protest against this oppression, the separation of Church and State, at least the entire independence of the Church in things spiritual, became naturally the distinctive principle which his "Relief Church" movement must embody. Doctrinally he had no contention with the Kirk; and even less than Erskine and his friends, did he stand on sectarian ground. In 1847 this body numbered 114 congregations, with 45,000 members.

And in 1847 these two bodies—the United Secession Church and the Relief Church—came together under the name of the "United Presbyterian Church of Scotland." Since that time there has not only been constant and considerable numerical growth, but in other most important respects there has been great progress, of which more presently.

Let us now discover the antecedents of our American United Presbyterian Church. In 1742 Lancaster and Chester County (Pa.) Presbyterians petitioned Mr. Erskine's Associate Presbytery in Scotland to send them ministers, but their request could not be complied with till 1753, at which date the Scotch Presbytery had grown into a Synod. Two ministers then came, and in obedience to instructions organized an Associate Presbytery in this country, to be a member of the Associate Synod in Scotland. But, three years before this, in answer to similar requests, the Reformed Presbyterians ("Covenanters") had sent over a minister, who with two Irish Presbyterian ministers constituted in 1774 a Reformed Presbyterian Presbytery. Not to dwell unduly upon the subsequent history, which involves, as did the history of the Scottish Presbyterians, repeated and more or less fruitless efforts at union, in 1858, at Pittsburgh, Pa., there was formed the "United Presbyterian Church of North America," the constituents being the legitimate successors of the above named two Presbyteries. Its first General Assembly

represented 5 Synods, 42 Presbyteries, 408 ministers, and some 55,000 communicants.

Now what is of significance as bearing upon our present topic is this: That the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian Church of North America stand to-day for very different types of Church life in doctrine and worship; and their present differences become a little more intelligible to us when we recall their respective origins. Both of these communions go back, on one side, to the "Associate Presbytery" of 1733; but in the Scottish body there was an alliance with a more catholic element, in the American with one certainly less catholic. In Scotland, so it would appear to the writer, the other element (the "Relief" movement) exerted a broadening influence, so that, even at the consolidation, there was secured a liberal platform for the united body. In America, on the contrary, the stricter and more sectarian temper of the "Covenanter" prevailed, and that is to-day the stamp which the united body bears.

Lest we seem to assert too much, let us adduce a few further facts in evidence. In America, United Presbyterians hold to close communion; in Scotland, Gillespie had said, "I hold communion with all that visibly hold the Head," and there the United Presbyterians to-day practice the same catholicity. In America their communicant membership is held to the same confessional subscription as the clergy and officers; in Scotland there is no doctrinal test administered to members on their admission. In America we may safely venture to say there is no immediate danger of a revision of the Confession; in Scotland, following after a liberal provision in the Basis of 1847, there came a Declaratory Act in 1879 whose Preamble and Seven Propositions embody, on the chief points of Calvinistic Theology, a very large and progressive statement.*

* In view of the importance of this Declaratory Act as one solution of the problem now engaging the largest body of the Presbyterians in America, we print it here in full:

"Whereas the formula in which the Subordinate Standards of this Church



In America the following declaration is still of binding force: "That it is the will of God that the songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in His worship, both public and private, to the end of the world; and, in singing God's praise, these songs should be employed, to the exclusion of the devotional compositions of uninspired men"—using them of course in metrical versions; in Scotland, the United Presbyterians were the first among Presbyterians to introduce hymns other than paraphrases into their worship.

Not to specify other points of difference, as for instance in the matter of organs and instrumental music, enough has been said to show that a liturgical movement in the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, was not so antecedently improbable as it certainly would have seemed to us. What Mrs. Oliphant are accepted requires assent to them as an exhibition of the sense in which the Scriptures are understood; whereas these Standards, being of human composition, are necessarily imperfect, and the Church has already allowed exception to be taken to their teaching, or supposed teaching, on one important subject; and whereas there are other subjects in regard to which it has been found desirable to set forth more fully and clearly the view which the Synod takes of the teaching of Holy Scripture; therefore the Synod declares as follows:

"1. That in regard to the doctrine of redemption as taught in the Standards, and in consistency therewith, the love of God to all mankind, His gift of His Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and the free offer of salvation to men, without distinction, on the ground of Christ's perfect sacrifice, are matters which have been, and continue to be, regarded by this Church as vital in the system of Gospel truth, and to which due prominence ought ever to be given.

"2. That the doctrine of the Divine decrees, including the doctrine of election to eternal life, is held in connection and harmony with the truth that God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; and that He has provided a salvation sufficient for all, adapted to all, and offered to all in the Gospel; and also with the responsibility of every man for his dealing with the free and unrestricted offer of eternal life.

"3. That the doctrine of man's total depravity, and of his loss of 'all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation,' is not held as implying such a condition of man's nature as would affect the responsibility under the law of God and the Gospel of Christ; or that he does not experience the striving and restraining influences of the Spirit of God; or that he cannot perform actions in any sense good, although actions which do not spring from

and "the Renaissance of the Scotch Church," the throb of a renewed Church life evident in more catholic sympathies, could not remain silent in this communion, standing on the basis hitherto chosen in 1847, and holding to the traditions it had inherited. For a liturgical movement is not simply an effort to bring to the public worship of the sanctuary the fruits of private life, after an better form—an improvement chiefly external: where there is nothing more than this, things may be expected to become (liturgically) worse before they are better. A true liturgical movement is at bottom an impulse of Faith: the Church more and more becoming a reality instead of an abstraction: and, therewith following, an effort to slough off sectarianism, and be once more simply Church; and, of course, by necessary consequence, a spirit of Christian Unity. As flowers a renewed heart are not spiritually good or holy,—such as accompany salvation.

"4. That while men are saved except through the mediation of Christ and by the grace of His Holy Spirit who worketh when, where, and how it pleaseth Him; while the duty of sending the Gospel to the heathen who are sunk in ignorance, sin and misery, is clear and imperative; and while the outward and ordinary means of salvation for those capable of being called by the Lord are the ordinances of the Gospel: in accepting the Standards it is not required to be held that any who die in infancy are lost, or that God may not extend His grace to any who are without the pale of ordinary means, as it may seem good in His sight.

"5. That in regard to the doctrine of the civil magistrate, and his authority and duty in the sphere of religion as taught in the Standards, this Church holds that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head of the Church, and 'Head over all things to the Church, which is His body;' disapproves of all compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion; and declares, as hitherto, that she does not require approval of anything in her Standards that teaches, or may be supposed to teach, such principles.

"6. That Christ has laid it as a permanent and universal obligation upon His Church at once to maintain her own ordinances, and to 'preach the Gospel to every creature;' and has ordained that His people provide by their free-will offerings for the fulfilment of this obligation.

"7. That in accordance with the practice hitherto observed in this Church, liberty of opinion is allowed on such points in the Standards, not entering into the substance of the faith, as the interpretation of the 'six days' in the Mosaic account of the creation; the Church guarding against the abuse of this liberty to the injury of its unity and peace."

are natural in springtime, and as fruit ripens during the genial summer—the thing of real significance and potency being the awakening Spring itself and the teeming Summer—so a liturgical movement is nothing of itself: if genuine, it is one outward expression of what is going on beneath the surface, of what is coming to pass in the inner life. And it is good to observe, by tokens many and unmistakable, what is coming to pass in many quarters of our present day Protestantism; of which tokens *Presbyterian Forms of Service* is one of the latest.

The book in its Preface does, indeed, deprecate “the imposition of a Liturgy,” meaning thereby, we take it, the obligatory and invariable use of a Liturgy; and further states that the forms given “are not intended to be used liturgically, but are offered merely as illustrations.” This is well, for two reasons: first, because Presbyterianism can never consistently return to the “imposition of a Liturgy” in such a sense, and we believe that Episcopalians themselves will come round to such a position eventually as that their Liturgy shall be held to be made for man and not man for their Liturgy; secondly, because the written prayers of this book, like most present day compositions in that kind, would prove rather wooden upon constant reiteration. But that does not sacrifice the liturgical principle. It remains yet to ask, What is the *structure* of these services? What is the *matter* of petition and intercession, of praise and thanksgiving? What is the range of models studied and followed? Is it confined to two or three centuries of Scottish Presbyterianism, or even Protestantism; or does it go back to the Early Church also? Considering all these circumstances, to wit: that it is the first book put forth by this Devotional Service Association, that it is for a ministry and a people bred, after all, in the atmosphere of Scotland*—we think this book on the whole very satisfactory as to both what it is and what it is not.

* That we mean nothing disrespectful to Scotland, but rather the more honor to these pioneers in a good work, let the reader satisfy himself by a perusal of an article in *Blackwood's* for November, 1890, on “The New Liturgies of the Scottish Kirk.”

250 *The U. P. of Swedes and their New Service Book*

But let us look through the book with more particular attention to its details.

First is given a *Lectionary*, in which, after Lessons for each Lord's Day in the civil year, is made some little provision for the festivals in the Church Year. Then follow some eight pages of carefully chosen Scripture sentences, for the beginning of worship. The Order of Service is the same for morning and evening, and is as follows: 1. Sentences. 2. Invocation, the people at the close of this, as of all prayers saying or singing, Amen. 3. Metrical Psalm or Hymn. 4. Confession and Supplication. 5. Lesson from the Old Testament. 6. Prose Psalm chanted, or Scripture sentence sung. 7. Lesson from the New Testament. 8. Thanksgiving, Intercession, Lord's Prayer said by all. Silent Prayer. 9. Psalm or Hymn, of Praise. 10. Prayer for Illumination. 11. Sermon. 12. Psalm or Hymn. 13. Brief Prayer. 14. Doxology. 15. Benediction.

The offering, if any, is placed between 8 and 9.

In addition to the prayers and collects embodied in the morning and evening services which are treated in full pp. 19-35, there are several more pages of selected collects.

Pausing a moment at this point, we note the great advance which such a scheme of service betokens over that which it is to supplant. But we note also the same excess, and the same defect, which are the generic marks of Protestant cultus, and more particularly of Calvinistic cultus: excess of the homiletic element, defect of the responsive element. Not that the sermon is too much made of; the fault lies deeper than that, and is, indeed, observable even in the English *Common Prayer*. We mean the vice of always and everywhere arguing, reasoning, explicating; whence come the too numerous "Dearly Beloved Brethren" of the Prayer Book, and the "eloquent and impressive prayers" of our non-liturgical divines. To make clear what we mean, lay down side by side "The Communion" of the Episcopal Church and "The Communion" of the new Lutheran *Common Service*. In the latter, service is more rigidly held to its own province, more entirely governed by its own

legitimate spirit; and this in spite of the fact that the *Prayer Book* tends to excess of ritual. Much greater the contrast when you take any of the Presbyterian Liturgies given in Baird's *Eutaxia*. The prayers, there written, with Presbyterians now unwritten, tend everywhere to be "preaching prayers;" they lack terseness, simplicity, directness; and therefore they lack the true liturgical flow.

And passing from the excess, we note, as we have said, a defect of the responsive element. The people have still too little voice in the worship. True, they have the hymns—where they do have them, not yet usurped by the artistic choir and the unspeakable anthem!—but they ought as well to have more *spoken* part. It is a good beginning to make them say, as Scripture enjoins, Amen; it is also a good thing to have them say the Lord's Prayer. Both these are still, with some, dangerous innovations, and doubtless required of our compilers some degree of courage, and therefore are not to be lightly esteemed. But the movement should go, and probably will go, much further.

But the Communion Service, which now follows, claims our attention. We copy the *Order* in full.

PREPARATION AND INSTRUCTION.

1. Introductory Sentences of Scripture. 2. Psalm or Hymn (Introductory). 3. Prayer for Grace. 4. Reading of Scripture. 5. Psalm or Hymn referring to Christ's Atoning Work. 6. Pre-Communion Address.

THE COMMUNION.

7. The Words of Institution. 8. Eucharistic Prayer (the Congregation responding by singing the Sanctus or the Hosanna). 9. Silent Prayer, and Uncovering of the Elements. 10. Communion Hymn. 11. Blessing of the Bread, and Distribution. 12. Blessing of the Cup and Distribution. 13. Song of Thanksgiving.

EXHORTATION AND DEVOTION.

14. Exhortation. 15. Prayer of Self-Dedication and Intercession. 16. Concluding Hymn. 17. Benediction.

NOTE—Should the Communion follow immediately upon the Sermon, Nos. 1-6 of the above may be omitted.

The Order thus outlined is filled out, point by point, in the succeeding pages, making at the least an ample Directory. But more than this. There are some standing parts which, though subject to some modification, yet suggest a degree of permanence; in this exactly parallel with the Ante-Nicene Liturgies. That, to instance but a few, there should be a *Sanctus* and *Hosanna*, and a modified *Surus Corda* ("It is most meet, right, and our bounden duty," etc.) is a noteworthy fact.

Another Order for the Lord's Supper is given, simpler, but containing also an Eucharistic Prayer, with the *Sanctus*.

What we have said in criticism of the Morning and Evening Services of the Lord's Day, again, and with even greater force will apply here. The prayers are, indeed, far from the foolish, aimless, sentimental, and "eloquent" order, which one sometimes hears; but they hardly rise to the height of the Communion prayers, of which the Holy Catholic Church now has so abundant treasure. More to be deplored is the absence of the directly responsive element, in which, here especially, it may be made outwardly manifest that all the communicants are set to be "an holy priesthood." Let us hope that, in much more besides the Lord's Prayer and the *Sanctus*, the people may have part in the highest of all Christian services.

After the Lord's Supper are given Orders for Baptism, for Admission to Full Communion, Ordination of Ministers, Ordination of Elders, and for the Dedication of a Church; and in conclusion, Orders for Marriage, and for Burial. The latter is very fully treated, in the way of Scripture and texts suggested, for which hardworked ministers will be duly thankful.

One thing we could not help observing: that the Apostles'

Creed is used but once in the whole book—in the Dedication of a Church; where it is given unmutilated, *i. e.*, with the *Descensus* clause left in its place. In the same service the Te Deum is also given. It seems that here, to the mind of the compilers, was the best place to begin with these much disused and misunderstood, but venerable and catholic forms: the consecration of a sanctuary suggesting naturally the days of the Church's first foundation, and the heritage of those days to which, by virtue of our continuity (unless we be a sect) we are justly entitled.

V.

CAN OUR PRESENT MODE OF PLACING PASTORS BE IMPROVED?

BY REV. A. E. TRUXAL, A.M.

THE inquiry to be discussed in this paper at once implies that our present mode of settling pastors is, in some respects at least, unsatisfactory and defective. Whether or not such be the case, will become manifest, we trust, by a description and an analysis of the mode of settling pastors now practiced amongst us. And should we, in our inquiry into the subject, discover defects and wrongs in our present practices, then it will be our duty to investigate the possibility and practicability of making such improvements in our present mode of procedure in the case, as will lessen if not entirely remove, these defects, without, however, opening the way for other defects equally great and deplorable as those now existing. For let it not be forgotten in the discussion of this subject, that changes are not always improvements, and, in remedying one wrong, room is often made for another wrong just as grievous.

The settlement of a pastor in a vacant charge, generally, necessitates the removal of a pastor from a charge in which he had been previously settled. Hence, before discussing the subject in hand in a direct way, we will give some attention to another inquiry, namely, When shall a pastor resign his charge? This is a matter intimately connected with the main question.

A leading professor in one of our theological seminaries, several years ago, in an article published in the *Messenger*, raised the question as to whether the pastoral relationship

ought not to be considered much in the same light as the marriage relationship. Is it not at least a spiritual union that ought not to be dissolved, except for the most weighty considerations?

Dr. J. H. Suydam of the Reformed Church in America, in a paper published in the *Christian Intelligencer*, last March a year, on "The duty in resigning a charge," introduced his subject with these words: "In churches of the Presbyterian order the minister is settled for life. This is the theory."

The position taken by these two eminent divines represents, no doubt, the ideal and theoretic conception of the pastoral relationship, as provided for in our system of Church order. But in this matter, as in everything else in this sinful, selfish and imperfect world, it is impossible, even approximately, to actualize the ideal; and our theory, however true and correct it may in itself be, we find to be largely impracticable, as Dr. Suydam, above quoted, also acknowledges in the body of his article, by describing a number of conditions when it becomes a pastor's duty to resign his charge. The principle that the ministry exists for the church, and not the church for the ministry must evermore be maintained. The church must not be made to suffer for the sake of the ministry; but the ministry, if need be, must make sacrifices, and suffer, perhaps wrongfully, for the sake of the church. Hence it becomes a minister's solemn duty to resign, when it becomes manifest that his continuance as pastor will work injury to the church.

But, though the true ideal cannot be fully, or even approximately actualized, it should not for that reason be renounced, or all efforts towards its actualization be abandoned. If the theory, as above stated, be a correct one, and consistent with our general system of church government and order, as it unquestionably is, then the Church should strive to bring her practices into conformity with her theory, and put forth her best efforts, all the time, to actualize her ideal, as much as possible. Is this being done? We fear not. Unmistakable evidences appear on all sides, that pastors and congregations are controlled by a very different conception of the pastoral rela-

tionship. When a minister is called and installed pastor of a charge, the general rule seems to be that he does not look upon the transaction as settling him for life, or for any very great length of time; but he regards it rather as a temporary arrangement only, a business agreement, not specially binding on the conscience, to be annulled at any time according to the will or whim of either party. As a consequence, he is prone to have eyes and ears open continually for a call to a more desirable field of labor. And when such call comes to him, without allowing his first installation to exert any restraining influence upon him, he simply resigns and goes to the new field. The solemn, ecclesiastical and spiritual act of installation is, without question, entirely too much trifled with.

In order to be true to their Lord and Master, and true to their installation obligations, when settled in a charge, ministers ought to put forth all their energies in the performance of their present duties, and with eyes and mind and heart set on the work in hand, they ought faithfully and patiently and cheerfully attend to the Master's business before them, without cherishing any serious or disturbing thoughts in regard to some other field of labor. But does such a spirit of devotion to the work in hand, of Christian patience and humble resignation, prevail among the pastors throughout the Church? Evidently not. For as soon as a charge becomes vacant, applications for the vacant field are at once sent in from all sections of the Church. We do not believe it a misrepresentation of the true state of affairs when we say, that about one-half of our pastors are always open to a call from a better field. And many are always on the *qui vive* for new work. This, surely, is an abnormal and unhealthy condition of things among the ministry.

But the rejoinder is made that, while the above statements are a correct representation of the prevailing spirit among the pastors of the Church, yet they are not to blame for the evil. The pastors would themselves rejoice "with an exceeding joy" if such were not the case, and they would be ready and willing

to have this state of things changed as quickly as possible. But the people, it is alleged, composing the congregations, have brought about and are evermore causing this restless spirit among the ministry; first, by not properly supporting the pastors set over them, and, secondly, by becoming restive under a pastorate that has continued for a number of years, and longing for a new shepherd to minister unto them in spiritual things.

It is undoubtedly true, that many of our charges are justly subject to such criticisms. They do not pay as large salaries as they could pay and in all honesty ought to pay. And frequently they do not meet their obligations to the pastor promptly, according to stipulations. And many members are not constant in rendering unto their pastor "all proper obedience in the Lord." As a consequence, many pastors are compelled to undergo privations and endure sufferings, and be filled with cares and anxieties in regard to worldly matters. In order to escape from such trials the pastor seeks a new field of labor. Again, the religion of many people is based on their personal feelings towards their pastor. The indifference and dereliction of such members, and their undisguised desire for a new minister, make it exceedingly unpleasant for a sensitive pastor and his family to continue their stay with such people. A new field is longed for.

But now, how is this wrong to be remedied?

1. Pastors ought to rise to the dignity and the rights of their position, and maintain by word and conduct, that, when duly called and regularly installed, then they are in charge of their work by the Lord's appointment; that they are ambassadors for Christ; that they have no right to forsake the work in hand; and further, that the people have no right to request or in any way cause them to resign their charges, unless there be unmistakable evidences that the Lord has work for them to do in other parts of His vineyard. Pastors ought, also, to cultivate such a spirit of Christian heroism, that would enable them to attend to the work assigned them, faithfully and patiently, though it re-

quire at their hands some unjust sacrifices and the endurance of some grievous wrongs.

2. And the classes throughout the Church ought to employ every means in their power to make pastors and charges realize that a pastoral relationship ought not to be dissolved, simply, because the minister would be personally benefited by making a change, or because the people desire a new pastor. The Classes ought to exercise the authority vested in them and insist upon it, that a pastor set over a charge shall do that work, and that the people are bound by the principles of common honesty, and by the higher and stronger principles of Christian fellowship and love, and by the most solemn ecclesiastical obligations, to render unto their pastor all proper obedience in the Lord, and to support him with a sufficient salary for his maintenance. Let the Classes, whenever the opportunity presents itself, urge pastors and charges to be faithful and true to their installation vows and obligations.

3. If pastors and the Classes would pursue the course above indicated, then, as a natural and necessary consequence, a considerable number of calls would be declined, and an equal number of resignations would be disallowed. And it is our opinion that if the number of applicants for the various vacancies, as they occur, were much reduced, and the number of rejections of calls largely increased, the effect upon ministers and congregations would be very wholesome and beneficial, and the first large step would thus be taken towards the improvement of our present mode of settling pastors.

But we are not unmindful of the fact that vacancies must of necessity occur. Vacancies are created by the death of pastors and by justifiable resignations. These vacancies cannot always be filled by graduates from our seminaries, as many of them require pastors of some age and experience in the work. Hence pastors must sometimes be taken from one charge and settled over another. Some calls ought, therefore, to be accepted and confirmed, and some pastoral relationships ought to be dissolved. And consequently our present mode of settling

pastors in vacant charges is a proper question for discussion, and the inquiry as to whether there is room for improvement in our present customs and practices, is entirely in place.

WHAT IS OUR PRESENT MODE?

A charge becomes vacant. The consistory invites some minister whom they know, or who has been recommended to them to preach in the charge with the view of becoming its pastor. After he has preached his "Trial Sermons" a congregational meeting is called and an election held, with this minister as the only candidate for the pastorate, to be voted for or against. If the result of the election is favorable to the candidate, the consistory, then, in the name of the congregation issues a call to him. He then after proper consideration either accepts or rejects the call. If he rejects it, the above process is repeated until some minister is found who does accept the call of the vacant charge to him. At this stage of the procedure, the case passes into the hands of Classis. If the minister is a member of a Classis different from the one to which the charge calling him belongs, he must then be relieved of the work in which he is engaged and dismissed by his Classis to the proposed new field of labor. At this point his Classis has the privilege and right of interfering with his plans and purposes, and of refusing to release him of his present obligation, or to dismiss him from its body. The Classes, however, ought not and do not take such negative action except for the most weighty consideration.

The Classis within whose bounds the vacant charge is located must consider the call to the minister and his acceptance thereof, with the view of confirming the same. This Classis has the right, because of irregularities or other sufficient reasons, to refuse to confirm the call. If such action be taken, it brings the procedure to an end, at least for the time being. But if the call be adjudged regular and there be no other grave obstacles in the way, it is then confirmed and a committee is appointed, who consummate the pastoral relationship by performing the installation ceremony.

Theoretically this is our mode of placing pastors; and at first view it seems a fair and judicious mode. But viewed in the light of its practical operations, it becomes subject to a number of unfavorable criticisms.

1. As soon as it becomes known throughout the Church that a given charge is vacant, applications for the pastorate are made, directly and indirectly, by ministers from near and far; names of available ministers are sent to the consistory from various quarters; professors of theological seminaries recommend their students; one member of the consistory hears of this minister, another member learns of some other minister that might be had. And as a consequence the consistory simply becomes bewildered by the large number of names of available ministers put before it. The officers know not whom to select. Their knowledge of the qualifications and adaptability for their pastorate of the ministers of the church is entirely too inadequate to enable them to make an intelligent and judicious selection of a candidate. Their action in the case consequently is apt to be largely a matter of guesswork. Some consistories, conscious of their inability to act intelligently in the matter, endeavor to supplement their knowledge of available ministers, by having a number preach for them successively, intending, after some experimenting in this way, to make a proper selection from among those thus brought before them. And in order not to violate the letter of the constitution, they have these ministers to visit them as supplies and not as candidates. Reasonable though this plan at first view appears, it has as a very general rule proven itself to be unsatisfactory to both the charges and the ministers. Our present mode of placing the entire responsibility of selecting a candidate for the pastorate upon the consistory, with anybody and everybody to recommend and advise, is neither efficient nor satisfactory.

In this connection it may be well to state some facts that are sometimes not kept in view. As is the case in other Churches, so in the Reformed Church, there are many ministers who possess all the necessary qualifications to serve efficiently any

charge in the entire denomination. And the number of such is much larger than vacant charges are apt to suppose. Hence congregations do not by any means gain as much as they imagine by being so fastidious in the selection of a pastor. They often pass many by, who, if chosen, would build up the people in their faith, and cultivate the Christian graces amongst them by edifying preaching and faithful pastoral work.

But there is after all a large number of ministers who are well qualified and specially adapted to the work of some charges, but who would not be so efficient in other charges. And there are a few persons in the ministry, too, who are incapable, for one reason or another, of serving any charge with a sufficient degree of success to justify their settlement in any pastorate. These facts will hardly be gainsaid. And now we hold that it is not possible for consistories, as a rule, to obtain such a discriminating knowledge of the ministry of the church as would enable them, unaided, to make an intelligent and judicious selection of a pastor.

2. The preaching of trial sermons is not a desirable feature in our present mode of placing pastors. In the first place, it is exceedingly unpleasant for a minister of ordinary sensitiveness to preach the gospel to a people when he is conscious and painfully conscious of the fact that his hearers are not present for the purpose of being edified by God's word, or to be spiritually benefited by the services of the sanctuary, but for the special purpose of inspecting the minister; of observing his personal appearance, his manner of reading, his mode of praying, and above all of passing judgment upon his sermons and his style of delivering them. A knowledge of this fact makes the sermons he preaches not only trial sermons but also exceedingly trying sermons for him. And in the second place, it is a great mistake for a congregation to suppose that they can form a correct judgment of a minister's fitness for the pastoral office amongst them simply by what they see and hear of him on the day he is put on trial before them. Some ministers have the ability of making a fine display of themselves when appearing

before a congregation for the first time, and then have but little left them after the first exhibition, with which to maintain for any great length of time, the first impressions made. They are like some shop-keepers who make a very striking exhibition of their goods in the show window, but do not have the quantity or quality of goods in stock with which to fulfill the promises made by the outside display. On the other hand, there are many other ministers who possess a large and continually increasing reserve force of knowledge, of wisdom, of good judgment, of pulpit ability and pastoral tact, and yet could not and perhaps would not try to make any specially marked impression upon the people to whom they have been invited to minister for the first time. And as a consequence of all this, it follows that serious mistakes are often made by congregations in selecting pastors. From which it results that inferior pastors are settled in superior charges, and superior pastors in inferior charges, and what is still worse, a number of efficient and faithful pastors are compelled to stand idle in the market place because no man hath hired them.

We see then the present mode of securing pastors for vacant charges is seriously defective. There is entirely too much looseness and uncertainty at many points in the procedure. Evils have resulted from our practices that loudly call for correction.

HOW SHALL IMPROVEMENTS BE MADE, AND WHAT REMEDIES SHALL BE APPLIED?

We will in the first place suggest some changes of a moderate character, and, secondly, others of a more radical nature.

1. We ask for such amendments to the constitution of the church as will make the directions given in regard to the matter in hand more definite and explicit. Let it be defined at greater length and in clear statements what the consistory shall do and shall not do; what the congregation shall do and shall not do; what the duties and privileges of the candidate are; and what the prerogatives and duties of the Classis are in the ecclesiastical transactions under consideration.

2. Let the constitution be enforced. One source of many evils has been, and now is, the ignorance and disregard of the present requirements of the constitution. The spirit and letter of that portion referring to the matter before us are often disobeyed by ministers and by congregations, and are not enforced by the Classes. Let the constitution be so amended as to be clear and definite on this point, and then let it be enforced and the effect on the church will be salutary and beneficial.

3. Let the importance of the "Trial Sermon" be reduced to the minimum. This feature of our present customs is often a delusion and a snare. People are frequently misled by the "Trial Sermon." The judgment of a congregation based solely on it is of but little value, be that judgment favorable or unfavorable. Hence the practice of having applicants for the pastorate occupy the pulpit on trial ought to be discountenanced. And the ministry could do much towards abolishing this custom by refusing to appear before congregations for trial. Congregations would then be compelled to gain their knowledge of available ministers in a different way. Our recommendation is that the consistory shall take the matter of procuring a pastor more fully in hand. Let them, by the aid of wise counsellors, thoroughly consider the ability and fitness of available ministers, and select such an one whom they can unanimously recommend, and then let every member of the consistory advocate the election of the minister whose name is placed before the congregation. The members of the congregation should then, under all ordinary circumstances, consider it their duty to vote for such a candidate.

This course would take much of the responsibility from the congregation, and place it on the consistory. And this is just what ought to be done. The powers of the consistory have been too much ignored in this very matter. We have been too democratic in our practices. The consistory is a distinct ecclesiastical body in our church order, is vested with authority and has some peculiar functions to exercise. The congregation ought to have some respect for the actions and decisions of the


We do not believe that any particular form of church government exists by "divine right." We can endorse the statement made in the Scotch confession, adopted in 1560, which in Art. 20, speaking of the form of Government says, "We do not think that any policie and an ordour in ceremonies can be appointed for all ages, times and places." And we file no objections to the position taken by the Westminster confession Art. I, Sec. 6,) when it says "That there are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of human nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word." In the New Testament elements of Congregationalism, of Presbyterianism and of the Episcopacy may unquestionably be found. In our opinion, in any given country, that form of church government ought to be adopted and developed which is most clearly allied to the civil government of the country and most in harmony with the general spirit of the people. For example, in a country whose national government is that of a monarchy, absolute or limited, a strong episcopal form of church government would no doubt be well adapted to the circumstances and be efficient. Whereas, in a country whose government has for a century or more been that of a free republic, a monarchical system of church order would not be so well adapted to the spirit of the people, nor would it likely be the most efficient. We do not think that any church officer, whatever the name of his office might be, with the prerogative and powers of a Bishop in the Roman Church, would be able to work harmoniously and accomplish any important good results in any Protestant church in the United States. But might not the Reformed Church provide for herself Bishops with functions similar to those exercised by the Bishops in the Methodist Episcopal Church? In this latter church the Bishops annually appoint every pastor to his particular field of labor. And as a general rule the various congregations are supplied with suitable pastors; and what is perhaps the most commendable feature in this system is that

every minister is assigned to some work and no congregation is allowed to remain vacant. Where there are no unemployed ministers and no vacant charges, there, there is efficiency in the government.

But the free working of this system is largely interfered with in the churches that have been practicing it. The prevailing spirit of the people in our country is dominated by the idea of individual liberty. The people of our land are very sensitive as to their personal rights. And this spirit asserts itself in various ways in the Methodist Church. Ministers often resort to different means by which they seek to influence the appointing power, so that their wishes and aspirations may be satisfied. And congregations not unfrequently inform the Bishop and his cabinet, in one way or another, and in no uncertain words, of their wishes and desires. And every now and then there comes to the surface a good deal of restlessness and chafing on the part of ministers and people under the appointments made by the Bishop. And were it not for the itinerancy, which is a fundamental element in their system, it is very doubtful whether their mode of stationing pastors could be maintained for many years longer. If the itinerancy were to be discontinued, and ministers were obliged to accept their appointments, and congregations to receive their pastors for an indefinite period of time, then the appointing system would have to be materially modified so as to allow ministers and people the exercise of more rights and greater privileges; else the appointing system would in all probability entirely fail them.

As we have already seen, in the Reformed Church pastorates are supposed to continue for a considerable length of time. In fact, the fundamental idea in our system is the direct opposite of that underlying the itinerancy. Hence it would prove impracticable for us to adopt, at least in full, the appointing system in vogue in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The people of the United States sometimes proudly boast that they have the best government and civil institutions in the



whole world. Without affirming or denying this claim, we would say that unquestionably our form of civil government is the best possible for our own people. And the government of the Reformed Church is very similar to that of the nation. Though the church, in formulating her system of government, did not pattern after the national order; the nation rather followed the lines marked out by the church. The presbyterial form of church government, in which the idea of a federal Republic is very predominant, is much older than the Constitution of the United States, and it is altogether probable that the authors of the national system were influenced more or less by the leading principles underlying the governmental system of the Reformed Churches. But in this matter, as in all things, always, and everywhere, the children of this world were wiser than the children of light. Our statesmen, in framing a constitution for the country, developed at once more fully the idea of a republic, and made provision for the administration of the three essential elements in every government, namely, the legislative, the judicial and the executive. Our system of church government is republican in form; and we are persuaded that we would not gain anything by exchanging it for some other form. We do not believe that any other form would be as well adapted to our circumstances and condition, and be as efficient in its operations as the form under which we are now working. But our system needs to be more fully wrought out and perfected in all its parts. In so far as any legislative, judicial and executive functions are exercised in our system at the present time, they are all mixed up together in each and every judicatory of the church; whereas the leading functions of a government ought to be separated from each other and lodged in different departments of administration. Our classical and synodical bodies are largely legislative in character. They do also at times exercise judicial functions. But scarcely any provision is made in our system for the executive element. It does not lie within the province of this paper to set forth the defects and describe the needs of our government on its judicial

side. In the new constitution, which had been before our church and is now in the hands of a committee for revision, full and definite provision was made for a judicial department. We wish to call attention to the weakness of the executive element in our government. Properly speaking, we have no executive officers at all. The presidents of our various judicatories are not executive, but really only presiding officers. There is no one in our system clothed with authority to execute the enactments and decisions of our classes and synods. There can be no question but that some officer is needed to enforce the constitution of the church and the actions of its legislative bodies. The subject under consideration in this article does not require us to show the many different ways in which an executive officer would be useful and beneficial to the church in general, but rather to point out the necessity for some such officer in the matter of securing pastors for vacant charges.

We believe our system of Government, in so far as it relates to the matter in hand, would be much improved, if each district Synod had a Bishop. Though we are not concerned about the name of such Synodical officer. He might be called a Superintendent, or Manager, or Director. But the name Bishop is biblical and historical, and the meaning of it is significant and very appropriate. A Bishop is an Overseer. What each Synod of our Church, in our view, needs is a Bishop to oversee the settlement of pastors in vacant charges. Other duties might also be assigned to him; such for example as attending to the Mission interests of the Synod. He might, as time and opportunity afforded, supply vacant Mission points and vacant charges until regular pastors would be settled over the same. But our plea now is for such an officer who shall aid and control charges in securing pastors. The course of procedure which we would recommend then is the following: When a charge becomes vacant let the consistory immediately inform the synodical Bishop of the fact. Let the Bishop make a thorough investigation of the wants, needs and condition of the charge, and then with the advice and consent of the consistory

place the name of a minister before the congregation for election. Let all applications for the charge be made to the Bishop, and let no candidate come before the congregation except such an one as has first been nominated by the Bishop. If the election held on the first name should result unfavorably to the nominee, or should he decline the call, the same process would have to be repeated with another candidate. If it should be deemed advisable to have the candidate preach before the congregation, after the nomination has been made and before the election is held, then let that be done. But we believe that in the majority of cases such preaching would not be necessary, nor would it be demanded. This modification or change in our present practices could be made without changing our general system of church government. Of course, constitutional provision would have to be made for the plan suggested and rules would have to be adopted for the election, tenure of office, guidance and government of the Bishop. An order of procedure that would deprive the congregation or its consistory of all voice in the selection of a pastor would be too revolutionary in its character to be introduced into our system, and would be altogether impracticable in the present condition of our church life. But the change which we are advocating, we believe, would be practicable, and beneficial to the Church.

BENEFITS.

1. The plan we have proposed would bring order out of the confusion which now so often prevails in the selection and settlement of pastors. The procedure would from beginning to end be under the direction and control of an efficient head. The looseness and uncertainty which adhere to our present practices would be displaced by definiteness and certainty.

2. It would enable the Church in her organized form to discharge the parental duty which she owes to the congregation as her child. The congregation must be cared for and provided with proper spiritual food. Congregations, like children, often know what they want but not what they need. The Church

How can the present Mode of placing Pastors be Improved?

The first duty of the Bishop would aid each congregation with such a shepherd as would nourish it with the Word and spiritual drink.

It would bring about a better adjustment of the ministers to the charges of the Church. Each minister would be placed in a charge for which he is specially qualified. The evils which are caused by our present system.

It would bring an efficient service many of the ministers who are now unemployed and looking for employment. It would reduce the number of vacant charges.

It would be a necessity to lessen materially the length of the pastoral year. Under the present arrangements charges remain vacant for several months, and sometimes indeed for a year. Through the helpful work of the synodical conference these vacancies could be obviated; which would be a great gain.

It would bring into proper prominence the love and authority of the Church as represented by the person and functions of the Bishop, and the office and power of the Synod. It would bring into closer relation to the church all the members of the Synod, and it would cause the church to be more united for the sake of its welfare, it would be a great gain to the authority of the Church.

A "Committee on the Pastoral Service" would have to be brought into existence, and most of its objectionable and unpleasant features, and many instances would entirely obviate the necessity of it.

In some sections of the Church the committee on supply performs a work similar to that which we are now asking to have committed to a synodical Bishop; and whenever this committee is unimpeded by outside interference, and the charge submits to its guidance and direction, the result proves satisfactory to all parties. But the performance of such work by this committee is an assumption of authority for which there is at present

no constitutional warrant—an authority too which can be exercised only by the tolerance of the charge.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

We will yet notice briefly a few objections to the plan of settling pastors in vacant charges, which we have submitted in this paper. It may be said that the same evils of which we now complain would also largely attend the mode of procedure suggested by us, and hence it would be no improvement. To this we can only reply, that an absolute certainty as to the results of such a system can be obtained in no other way than by putting it into operation. Experience alone can reveal to a certainty what the effects and results of such a plan would be. And yet, we claim that the premises laid down by us are founded on indisputable facts, and that the conclusions are logically and legitimately drawn.

Again, it may be objected to the plan on the ground that the synodical Bishop might abuse his trust; might be tyrannical in the exercise of his authority; that he might be partial. But to fear such danger is to assume that the Bishops would be incapable or unscrupulous men. Such an assumption would be an undeserved reflection on the ministry of the church. Some ministers for different reasons would not be properly qualified to attend to the duties devolving on such synodical officer. But there are many ministers, thoroughly honest and fair, just towards all men, possessed of good judgment, devoted to the welfare of the church and consecrated to the service of the Master, who unquestionably could fill such office with ability and efficiency. Many officers of our civil government are vested with authority to nominate and appoint others to offices and positions of trust. And the general rule is that capable and efficient men are appointed. Is it too much to believe that our synods would elect such ministers to the office of Bishop as would honestly, fairly, judiciously and efficiently administer the trust of selecting pastors for vacant charges? Surely not.

CONCLUSION.

Let us remember that no institution of human creation is perfect in every part; that no form of church government is complete in all its provisions, and if it were possible for us to have a perfect system of government it could not be administered perfectly, for the reason that Christian ministers and Christian people are themselves imperfect. Their knowledge is always more or less defective; their understanding not perfectly clear; their judgment never absolutely true; their feelings and will are affected by inherent selfishness and the general depravity of human nature, and hence their acts and transactions are always lacking to a greater or less extent of absolute perfection.

Hence, in order that any form of church government or any system of ecclesiastical order may be improved in its operation, it is first of all necessary that ministers of the gospel humble themselves evermore at the feet of Jesus, and consecrate themselves entirely to His service. They need to maintain an unwavering faith and firm trust in their gracious Saviour, and cultivate a spirit of true piety and faithful devotion; so that they may be able to endure hardships patiently, and, if need be, make sacrifices willingly, as faithful soldiers of the cross. And thus by their example as well as teaching, they will call forth and nurture these same Christian virtues in their people, who will then, moved by faith, love and devotion, be disposed to co-operate harmoniously with the ministry in all things pertaining to the welfare of the kingdom of Christ, including the ecclesiastical matter of selecting pastors and placing them over vacant charges.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.

BY REV. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

THE death of Cardinal Newman brought again to public attention that great movement in religious life which is commonly called the Oxford or Anglo-Catholic movement, of which he was the prime mover and the most picturesque figure. It will be my aim to tell what that movement was, give some account of the men who carried it forward, and describe its influence on the English Church.

Chief of those devout and single-minded scholars and students who, in the year 1833, commenced this campaign was John Henry Newman. Born in the second year of this century, he received evangelical training, expresses himself as much indebted to Romaine, Scott, and the other leaders of that school in the Church of England, and formed his early religious life as their pattern. Says Newman: "Scott made a deeper impression on my mind than any other. To him, humanly speaking, I almost owe my soul."* He was converted at fifteen, and of the reality of that inward change he never had any doubt. "I am still more certain of it," he says, long after he became a Roman Catholic, "than that I have hands and feet."† While at Oxford he came under the influence of Hawkins, Keble, James and others, and these men, with the studies which he was carrying on in the early church history, led him to abandon the evangelical for the Catholic standpoint. The sweet and noble attractiveness of his character, his strange personal magnetism, his calmness and self-possession united with his religious earnest-

* *Apologia pro Sua Vita*, 5th Ed., N. Y., p. 56.

† *L. c.*, p. 56.

ness and sincerity, made him before he knew it, and without his wish, the leader of the party. James Anthony Froude, who was at Oxford at the time, bears testimony to the enthusiasm with which the young men of the university crowded around him.

"This it was that we," says Froude, "who had never seen such another man, and to whom he appeared, perhaps, at special advantage in contrast with the normal college don, came to regard Newman with the affection of pupils (for pupils, strictly speaking, he had none) for an idolized master. The simplest word which dropped from him was treasured as if it had been an intellectual diamond. For hundreds of young men *Credo in* Newman was the genuine symbol of faith." *

This leadership Newman maintained until 1841, when the publication of Tract 90 obliged him to retire from Oxford. After long, profound and careful study, he became convinced that the logic of his principles led to Rome, and that the Church of England was destitute of true Catholicity, and so in 1845, at the expense of losing all he held dear, he united with the Roman Church.

Associated with him was John Keble, the gentle singer of the movement, a man of simple and beautiful piety, beloved of all who knew him, but of much narrower intellectual sympathies than his colleague. He published his *Christian Year* in 1827 and its influence on the dead religious life of England was like a moist wind on parched plants. Its exquisite music, its passionate devotion to the Lord, its freshness and variety in setting forth the doctrines of faith, its making nature the symbol of spiritual realities, the sweetness, and often plaintiveness of its strains,—a prophet in its weeping over an apostate Church, and a prophet in the sternness of its rebuke, all these qualities gave the *Christian Year* an immense power over religious minds, a power it still wields.

Newman in his *Apologia* pays a generous tribute to Keble, both as to his poetry and his general religious teaching. He

* *Good Words*, 1881. See *Library Magazine* (N. Y.) viii. 81.

thinks that the two main truths the *Christian Year* brought home to him "were the same which (he says) I have learned from [Bishop] Butler, though recast in the creative mind of my new master. The first of these was what may be called, in a large sense of the word, the sacramental system, that is, the doctrine that material phenomena are both the types and instruments of things unseen." The second principle was Keble's reinforcement by faith and love of Butler's doctrine of probability as the guide of life. Faith and love are directed to an object, in which they live. This gives it moral certainty.*

In 1833 Keble preached his famous sermon on "National Apostasy," in which he scathed the church for its worldliness, liberalism and loss of faith, and called it back to its old paths. This sermon Newman considered as the real start of the movement.

Another leader was Richard Hurrell Froude, brother of the historian, who died at the beginning of a life of golden promise. Froude was a man of exceeding earnestness of conviction, who would brook no compromises or half-way doctrines. He was withal narrow and intolerant in his spirit, and without the balance and largeness of view of Newman and Pusey. He fought the reformation tooth and nail, had a high idea of virginity and penance, and was drawn much to the mediæval church. There is no doubt that, had he lived, he would have joined Newman, Oakley, and the band who went to Rome.

After Newman's retirement Edward Bouverie Pusey became the animating mind in the new crusade. Pusey was a man of large learning, great diligence, and thorough devotion to religion. His high position as Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church gave to the movement dignity and strength. "He had vast influence in consequence of his deep religious seriousness, the munificence of his charities, his professorship, his family connections and his easy relations with the university authorities." *Apologia*, p. 107. Pusey's life-long service in the cause of Anglo-Catholicism, his literary

* *Apologia*, pp. 68, 69.

energy and the influence, consistency and earnestness with which he advanced his views, gave his name in after years to the movement.

There were other men who were connected with this theological movement in the English church: Hugh James Rose, William Palmer, William George Ward, Arthur Philip Percival, John Williams, all able and capable men. Of the Oxford revolution of 1833, it can truly be said that it would be hard to find anywhere a set of men of more earnest piety, more resolute determination to serve God and the church, and a more lofty devotion to a religious ideal. They presented many points in common with the Unitarian movement of that same university a hundred years before. They were not less serious in their lives, nor less free from the temptations of the time and the worldliness of the church, nor less themselves to what they considered their first and greatest duty with no less concentrated spirit. That their aim was not the highest, that the means by which they sought to realize it brought in their own savings in the case of many of them, that extravagance and immorality marked the development of the movement they set on foot, cannot take away from the purity of intention and grandeur of aim of that heroic band of men seeking the restoration of the glories of the old Catholic Church.

What did the movement mean? It bore, first, upon doctrine and secondly upon church life. At the time at which it arose—1830—40, liberalism was everywhere infecting both politics and theology. Sir Robert Peel had introduced his bill for the emancipation of the Catholics, which became law in 1829, a bill which was bitterly opposed by the orthodox party in the church and among the Dissenters. "The whigs had come into power," Lord Grey had told the bishops to set their house in order, as some of the prelates had been insulted and threatened in the streets of London. A bill had passed the House suppressing ten of the Irish bishoprics (1833), a terrible blow to men who believed in the divine order of the episcopate and its indefectibility. The monarchy had been overturned in France in 1830 by

bloodless revolution and Charles X had to take refuge in England. The clergy of the Episcopal church were worldly and selfish, at ease in Zion, having perished the godly simplicity of the old evangelicals. No doubt there were many honorable exceptions, but Gieseler, speaking of this period, says that 'zeal for religion and the church died out almost entirely. Divine service conducted by hirelings degenerated in a lifeless mechanism.'* An Episcopal authority of the present day gives a like testimony. "The services were decent and decorous; the bishops prosperous and good-natured; the preaching ethical and worldly wise; and the nation in a comfortable, religious slumber."† And Sydney Smith said to Gladstone in 1835, "Whenever you meet a clergyman of my time, you may be sure he is a bad clergyman." ‡ Newman, fresh from his reading in the first ages of the church, could not but feel that the glory had indeed departed from Israel. "With the establishment thus divided and threatened," he says, "thus ignorant of its true strength, I compared that fresh, vigorous power of which I was reading in the first centuries. In her triumphant march in behalf of that Primeval Mystery to which I had so great devotion from my youth, I recognized the movement of my spiritual mother. '*Incessu patuit Dea.*' The self-conquest of her ascetics, the patience of her martyrs, the irresistible determination of her bishops, the joyous swing of her advance, both exalted and abashed me. I said to myself, "Look on this picture and on that." I felt affection for my own church, but not fondness; I felt dismay at her prospects, anger and scorn at her do-nothing perplexity. I thought that if liberalism once took footing within her, it was sure of the victory in the event. I saw the reformation principles were powerless to rescue her. As to leaving her, the thought never crossed my imagination;

* See Gieseler, *Church History*, translation Smith and Robinson, V., p. 472.

† Rev. Julius H. Ward, "The Oxford movement in the English Church," *Andover Review*, July, 1889, p. 62.

‡ Wilfrid Meynell, "Cardinal Newman and his Contemporaries," in *Contemporary Review*, Sep., 1890.

still I ever kept before me that there was something greater than the established church, and that that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set us from the beginning, of which she was but the local presence and organ. She was nothing unless she was this. She must be dealt with strongly, or she would be lost. 'There was need of a second reformation.' *

This reformation the Oxford reformers proceeded to inaugurate. They first preached the supremacy of dogma. The doctrines defined in the ecumenical creeds were given by the church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, and must be received. Dogma is the foundation of religion. Any departure from the Dogmatic structure of the old Catholic church is soul-destroying heresy. Second, based on this foundation they taught that there was a "visible church with sacraments and rites which are the channels of invisible grace." The Holy Ghost is given in ordination; confession and absolution is recognized in the visitation service in the Prayer Book; the baptismal service teaches the regeneration of the infant; and the sacramental service gives "verily the body and blood of Christ." The rites and doctrines of the ancient church were to be restored in their full power, believed in and solemnly celebrated by the clergy, according to the teaching and implication of the Prayer Book. The august mysteries of the faith were not to be emptied of their consolation and fulness by an unbelieving ministry. The English church professed to be in harmony with antiquity. Let her not, then, sacrifice the truths for which the martyrs died at the bidding of a cold and senseless liberalism. Third, the Oxford reformers exalted the bishop. The bishop was the representative of Christ's authority. The bishop was pope. Clerical discipline should be reasserted. The bishops should assert their rights in the fear of God for the parity of the church. Fourth, the church of Christ existed in three forms, the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglican. Having the apostolic succession and the note of catholicity, the Anglican branch could fully maintain her

* *Apologetica*, p. 80.

place as to the Church Catholic, and with the advantage over Rome of having kept the apostles' doctrine in a much purer form. What is needed is to bring the English church into the full realization of her Catholic position, and in her teaching, ceremonies and discipline to act in harmony with her professed principles.*

As to the Christian life and worship, the effort was made to make solemn, stately and beautiful the services of the sanctuary, and bring the architecture of the church and the performance of the various parts of the worship in conformity with the mystery, spirit and honor due to the divine glory. Fasting, abstraction from worldly duties, holiness of life, humility and purity, were insisted on as essential to the priest.

Such was the Oxford Movement of 1833, the most important religious upheaval of the English-speaking world in this century. It was made possible by the complex character of the English Church, the Catholic and Protestant elements being equally present in her constitution. Her Articles of Religion have a strong Protestant flavor; but her Prayer Book and her Homilies, which are also her legal documents, give full play to Catholic principles. Newman and Pusey stood squarely on these latter charters, called themselves the successors of her illustrious fathers, Bramhall, Hooker, whose *Ecclesiastical Polity* was edited by Keble, Laud, Taylor, Jackson, Wall, and the Catholic party of the seventeenth century. They republished the works of these English Churchmen under the title of the Anglo-Catholic Library. And inasmuch as the English Church made it her boast against Rome that she was true to the doctrines and discipline of the early Catholic Church, they made constant appeal to the Fathers, printed extracts from them in their Tracts, and started in 1838 the Library of the Fathers, which published forty-six volumes of the early Christian literature. It is my deliberate opinion that, with the exception

* In *Apologia*, pp. 95-103, Newman gives the platform which guided the movement in its beginning. His remarks on the Church of Rome are especially interesting.

of individual vagaries and the extremes to which in some cases the doctrines were put, the Tractarians occupied a position historically tenable as English Churchmen. The High Church school is as legitimate a development of some of her principles as is the Broad or Low Church schools. The English Church, with the true instinct of a catholic and historic Church, seeks for comprehension; the recent denominations, with the impatience and narrowness of sects, seek for excision of all things not in harmony with the majority.

The results of this Movement have been most potent. The earnestness and devotion of these men were rewarded. Their teachings found congenial soil and took root. Their Tracts (ninety in all, published from 1833 to 1841) were circulated far and wide, and left in almost every parsonage in England. In his essay on the "Prospects of the Anglican Church," Newman collects several testimonies as to the spread of their doctrines. Baden-Powell is quoted as follows: "It is clear from published authorities, that opinions and views of theology (of at least a very marked and peculiar kind, applying more especially to the subject of Church authority and others dependent on it), have been extensively adopted and strenuously applied, and are daily gaining ground among a considerable and influential portion of the members, as well as ministers of the Established Church—" Bishop Sumner refers to the subject as "daily assuming a more serious and alarming aspect." Another author says:

"They (the Church doctrines) have indeed already made fearful progress in different parts of the country, and are now making rapid progress where they were before unknown. One of the largest churches in Brighton is crowded every Sunday hear these doctrines preached by the Rev. Mr. Anderson; so the church of Dr. Hook, in Leeds. In fact there are few towns of note to which they have not extended; nay, they have reached obscure and insignificant places in the remotest parts of the kingdom. They are preached in small towns of Scotland. They obtain in Elginshire, which is six hundred miles north of London; and I found them myself in the heart of the

nds of Scotland, when traveling there three months

se doctrines in the main are now the ruling tradition in Anglican Church. They control the utterances of her ; the deliverances of the last Pan-Anglican Council in harmony with this tradition; and the attitude of the pal Church to other communions is due to the same

The Evangelical and Broad Church schools exist e influential, but the High Church school, which takes bstantial ground of the Oxford reformers, holds the

influence of this school in religious life has been pro-

The churches become once more crowded with wor-
Early services, missions or revival meetings, retreats
ial seasons for devotion, the weekly administration of
rd's Supper, more power and earnestness in preaching,
ve characterized the spread of these principles. The
h Church has had a marvelous energy in spiritual and
ary development within the last fifty years, and it has
argely due to the tremendous earnestness of the High
clergy. This is acknowledged on all hands. Professor
x, in the article, "Oxford Tracts," in the McClintock
trong's Cyclopedia, says that "with all its narrowness
rors, it has infused an entirely new spiritual life into
as once the very staid and cold life of the High Church
n the Church of England. It has also in the same way
l the Protestant Episcopal Church in America." The
ames W. White, of Wisconsin, in some excellent articles
Bibliotheca Sacra (Oberlin, O.), for October, 1889, and
y, 1890, on the "Anglo-Catholic Movement," says:
ead the history of the condition of practical religion, both
the clergy and laity half a century or more ago, and
mpare it with the present in the districts where the new
an ideas prevail, is sufficient to convince any candid
that the Oxford Movement has been in a true sense a
man, *Essays, Historical and Critical*, 8th Edition, Vol. I., pp. 264, 265.

revival of religion as well as of ecclesiasticism" (January, pp. 95, 96). He also says that "the Oxford revival must be regarded as having had a leading share in the unprecedented advance of the Anglican church in recent times" (p. 97). Mrs. Ward, with fine appreciation, has sketched one of the High Church clergy in the character of Newcome in *Robert Elsmere*. With such burning earnestness as his have these men carried their sacramental Gospel to the slums of the Christian city and to the wilds of the heathen lands. But recently the world has done homage to one of this school when the news was sent forth of the death of Canon Liddon, the splendor of whose eloquence in his historic temple was the fitting expression of a singularly pure and exalted type of Christian manhood and the fitting vehicle of the great truths of the Gospel of Christ, which, with the positiveness and precision of a robust and fearless faith, were given forth from that illustrious pulpit.

I have not space to point out the defects of this Movement. By placing the authority of doctrine on the law of the church instead of on the individual reason and conscience enlightened by the Holy Spirit, you drive men either to scepticism or to Rome. The integrity of the soul cannot be given over into the hands of tradition and the past. While the past is full of lessons of the highest value, and while the doctrinal attainments of the Church are to be considered with reverent and due attention, the final appeal is to be made to the judgment of the believer informed by the Word of God and the Spirit which verifies that Word in the experience. It is not indeed to be charged as a defect of the Movement that the liberalism which Newman and his men dreaded and fought they did not drive from the English church. But this failure has indeed been the fact. The power of a living and spiritual, as opposed to a dogmatic and sacramentarian theology, has never been so active and strenuous as since the days of the Oxford Tracts. At the very moment when Newman was leaving Oxford, that University was nurturing the men who should break the shackles of the Puseyites. While the Tractarian movement, by its ardor

and holy zeal, was bringing many into the church, by its narrowness and fierce ritualism it was driving many out, The same tide which would have borne Richard Hurrell Froude into the Roman Church, had he lived long enough, and which made John Henry Newman the prince of Roman controversialists, landed the younger Froude and the elder Newman on the shores of scepticism. It was a game of profit and loss. Better than the position of either is the stand of him who keeps his spiritual vision undimmed to behold the glory and the truth of God in the face of Jesus Christ, his reason untrammelled to weigh all the doctrines of men, and his soul independent of all masters save One. And this is the very essence of Evangelicalism : the Word of God is the only rule of faith ; the heart is the seat of religion and the chief organ of religious knowledge ; and the Christian consciousness guided by the Word and Spirit of God is the verifier and test of dogma.*

The Anglo-Catholic Movement has a mission, however, in the Divine Providence which watches over the history of the church. It was an effort to realize the continuity and majesty of a Catholic Church and of Catholic truth. "There are few who will not acknowledge," says the late Principal Tulloch, of the Church of Scotland, a most impartial critic of this Movement, "that the Oxford Movement has done more than all other movements in our time to revive the grandeur of and grace of historical communion and church life, and no less the true place of beauty and art in worship. It is much to have brought home to the hearts of Christian people the reality of a great spiritual society extending through all Christian ages, living by its own truth and life, having its own laws and rights and usages. In a time when the dissidence of dissent and the canker of sectarianism have spread to the very heart of our

* The reader will find some excellent remarks on the meaning and place of the Evangelical Revival in the progress of theology and its influence on the doctrinal unity of the churches, as well as on the Tractarian Reaction in relation to it, in the lecture by Professor George R. Crooks, of Drew Theological Seminary, delivered in the Boston Monday Lectureship, and published in the volume, *Christ and Modern Thought* (Boston and London, 1882).

national existence, with so many unhappy results, the idea of a church as a vast unity—and no less the idea of Christian art—of the necessity of order and beauty in Christian worship—are ideas to be thankful for. That both these ideas are capable, as history proves, of rapid abuse, unless interpenetrated by the light of reason, and used with purity of heart, is no ground for rejecting either. It is the very function of Christian sense to hold the balance of truth, and by proving all things, to hold fast that which is good.”*

LITERATURE.—Newman, *Apologia pro Sua Vita* (London, 1864, often reprinted), written with the utmost simplicity and candor, and with all the charms of clearness, directness and purity of style with which its author is master. Newman, *Essays, Critical and Historical* (London, 1871; 8th Edition, 1888), *Essays* VII., VIII., X., XVI. Mozley, Rev. T., brother-in-law to Newman, *Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement* (London and Boston, 1884). Ward, Wilfrid, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement* (London, 1889). These are the chief works. Estimates of Newman, or of his co-workers, or of the Movement in one or more of its phases, will be found in Stanley's *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold* (see Index); Ashwell and R. G. Wilberforce's *Life of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce*, Chapters IV., VII., VIII., XIII.; Stoughton's *History of Religion in England*, last volume; Gieseler's *Church History*, last volume, and articles without number in the theological reviews. The recently published *Correspondence of Newman while in the English Church* (London and New York, 1891) does not add materially to our knowledge of the Movement. But another book published since the above article was written, *The Oxford Movement, 1833–1845*, by the late lamented Dean R. W. Church (London and New York, 1891), ought by all means to be consulted.

* *Movements of Religious Thought in Great Britain*, Ch. III., end.

VII.

THE COMING IDEAL CHURCH.

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

It is not proposed to write concerning the coming ideal Baptist Church, or Episcopal Church, or Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Reformed Church. If it were, all we would be required to do would be to make a thorough study of the best parts of the standards of doctrines, rules of discipline, and distinctive characteristics, of the church chosen to be written about, and picture out a church that comes nearest to the fulfillment of their spirit and teaching. We purpose, however, to present some thoughts in regard to the coming ideal Church irrespective of denominational conceptions of what such should be. Our view, therefore, is to sweep beyond any denominational horizon.

I. Consider first, the coming ideal Church as to *organization*.

'Tis true the Church of Christ in its real and ultimate essence is not necessarily an organization: it dates antecedently to and independently of any organization. In the sense of a *spiritual* power, working in the hearts of the believers, "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven,"—which Christ declared to be "in" the believer,* and Paul speaks of as not being "meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" † is the real Church in its ultimate essence; and as such is not an organization. "The invisible and the spiritual is the vital force, the moulding power, the in-

* Luke 17: 20, 21.

† Rom. 14: 17.

fruit is secured by the continuance and ultimate completeness of the process — just as the seed is the vitality of the tree, as the yeast which assimilates the meal with which it is incorporated sustains the vine from which the wine is expressed."

The Church, however, of the visible Church, which, in the process of time as well as by a natural course of historical development, will grow into power and extension, and will be organized. And as in the past, so in the future, the Church will necessarily tend toward visible self-organization. The Episcopate in this connection well says: "Because so the Church consists of all those throughout the world who profess the true religion, some have hastily inferred that the Church is nothing more than the visible assembly of those who belong to it, and that its unity is nothing more than an aggregation of its members. They might as well say that because a city or State consists of the whole number of its inhabitants, therefore it is nothing more than an aggregation of those who are born or adopted into it. The United States consists of sixty millions of people, and since these people are the United States; and since the Government is ultimately upon their opinions and sentiments, it is a thing altogether inward and invisible. This reasoning is as faulty when applied to a kingdom as when applied to the kingdom of God. It necessarily implies an organized State, and the Church is no longer a stranger and foreign body, but a member of the household of God. A member of the Church, as the name implies, is one of a household, though it has many members, is organized."

But let us ask, what will the organization of the coming Church be? Will it be one great hierarchical body with a central head and an ordered succession and gradation of

* *The Church: Her Ministry and Sacraments*, p. 43.

* *The Church: Her Ministry and Sacraments*, p. 48.

officers? Will it be a doing away with all denominations, massing the great body of believers and adherents of Christianity into one permanently organized body-religious? * Will that be the ideal Church? Not to say a word about the necessity, should that be attempted, of changing entirely the spirit and nature of Protestantism, whose genius is not in the line of manipulating and governing people in one great mass, as is the nature and power of Roman Catholicism, it would be necessary to change the entire course of the history of the Church, which always has been, and doubtless will be, subject to variations according to the changing conditions of society.

Dr. A. A. Hodge has written: "The permanent results of biblical interpretation unite with the history of Christ's providential and gracious guidance of the churches in proving that He never intended to impose upon the Church as a whole any particular form of organization. Neither He nor His apostles ever went beyond the suggestion of general principles and actual inauguration of a few rudimentary forms." † These forms have always taken shape and course according to the development of time and of historical conditions "resulting from national character, and from political, social, educational, and geographical circumstances." Hence it would be but a waste of time to speculate as to the form which the organization of the coming ideal Church will assume. As long as human nature remains as it is, and Providence continues to work as it does, we cannot look for the ideal Church to come in a process by which all believers are to be absorbed into one great body, to be called *the Church*. There are differences of tasks, of education, of conditions, of peoples, of habits of thought and life, and as long as these remain there will be differences in the ways in which people will prefer to conduct their worship and to live the non-essentials of Christianity in the world; and we believe it to be true that "a time can never come when many of these

* "The time for world-empires, whether of the Church or the State, is past."—Vandyke, "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," p. 71.

† "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes," p. 304.

differences, so evidently designed, will be obliterated.* * They need not necessarily in order to have unity. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God who worketh all things in all."† Uniformity is not more necessary to constitute unity in the Church than in Nature. "All living unity implies diversity; and just in proportion to the elevated type and significance of the unity will be the variety of the elements it comprehends. In the barren desert each grain of sand is of precisely the same form with every other grain, and therefore there is no organic whole. The life of the world results from the correlation of earth and sky, of land and sea, of mountains and plains," not at all uniform, yet one grand unity. "All social unity springs out of the differences between man and woman, parent and child, men of thought and men of action, the men who possess and the men who need. No number of similar stones would constitute a great Cathedral. No number of repetitions of the same musical sound would generate music. Always where the most profound and perfect unity is effected it is the result of the greatest variety and complexity of parts."‡ The true life of the coming ideal Church will be unity resulting from the correlation of the accidental differences between the various denominations that are one in essence.

*Of course, it is not meant that people are at liberty to adopt any form or manner of worship that their tastes or education or habit of thought or life may lead them to do irrespective of the teachings of the Scriptures. "The church is to be governed by principles laid down in the Word of God, which determine, within certain limits, her officers and mode of organization; but beyond these prescribed principles and in fidelity to them, the church has a wide discretion in the choice of methods, organs and agencies. * * * Christ in His infinite wisdom has left His church free to modify her government, in accordance with these principles, as may suit her circumstances in different ages and nations."—Charles Hodge, D.D., "Polity of the Church," p. 277.

† 1 Cor. 12: 4-6, R. V.

‡ Dr. A. A. Hodge, "Popular Lectures," pp. 306, 307.

tials.* And is it not safe to say with Dr. A. A. Hodge that "undoubtedly a time is soon coming when the law of differentiation so long dominant, shall be subordinated to the law of integration, when all these differences so arduously won shall be wrought into the harmony of the perfect whole"? May God speed that day! It should be the great object of those especially filling places of leadership in the Church to do their utmost by precept and example to cultivate the real union of the churches by "promoting the central spiritual unity of the Church which comprehends them all. For this end all who call themselves Christians must with one purpose seek to bring their whole mind and thought more and more into perfect conformity to the word of God speaking through the Sacred Scriptures, and their whole life and activity more and more into subjection to the Holy Ghost dwelling in the whole body and in all its members alike." We have reason to rejoice in the "signs of the times" in this regard. For it is true, as Dr. Van Dyke has said: "The unity of Christendom—a unity that the world can see, and be convinced by it that the Father has sent His only begotten Son—is to-day a longing in the hearts and a prayer on the lips of multitudes of Christians." †

* "The unity of the Church can be effected only by a vital power dwelling in every part and common to all. That power can be none other than the Holy Spirit. * * * * The unification of Christian denominations must be attained by bringing out into clearer recognition and adjusting to new relations that which is already in them. The first stage in this process is the practical acknowledgment that the things in which they agree, whether in doctrine, discipline, or worship, are not only more important in their bearing, but more and greater in themselves than the things in which they differ. * * * * Beginning on a small scale, and embracing at first only the subdivisions of sects, holding the same system of doctrine and order, and separated by distinctions as small as the difference between a psalm and a hymn, or between the sound of a pitch pipe and the swell of an organ, who shall say that it will not enlarge its circumference and intensify its assimilating power until it includes the Christian world in its embrace. It is easy to sit in the seat of the polemic, surmising difficulties and predicting failures; but it is far nobler to hope for and hasten unto the blessed time when out of many folds there shall be one flock and one Shepherd."—H. J. Van Dyke, D.D., "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," pp. 71, 72, 73.

† "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," p. 65.

But now the question arises, How is that unity to come? That is, what form is it to assume?

We do not believe that the Church to become thus ideally a unity need destroy all denominationalism, and become uniform in worship and religious habits, any more than an army to become ideally a unity need destroy all its divisions or regiments, and the soldiers be thrown together in one great uniform mass. The ideal Church does not call for less denominationalism, but for more love and sympathy and co-operation and confederation and confidence among the denominations.*

The ideal church will be an organized denominationalism, just as the ideal army is a body of organized regiments, showing a unity of spirit and effort, and of prayers and of hopes.† Not envious of, or at strife with each other, impeding the progress of the forces moving against a common enemy, by quarrels, and by one regiment aiming its guns and bayonets at the other, but with all guns and bayonets pointing in one straight line at the enemy. Give us this latter and the enemy will soon

*"Men cannot and ought not to renounce their personal convictions of truth. If you should dissolve all Christian denominations to-day, it would create not union, but anarchy. If you should renounce all creeds, the result would be, not a broader faith, but a confusion of tongues."—Van Dyke, "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments," p. 66.

† Should this be the case, and wherever it is the case, is it not the fulfilment of the prayer of Christ, when He prayed for the unity of believers (John 17: 21), and by such a unity would not the world be able to see, and seeing, be constrained to believe in the divine mission of the Saviour? The question is often asked; Can this prayer be fulfilled without an incorporated organic union of all denominations into one body? (Originally, no doubt such was the case in the Church of Christ. But, with the development of time is such possible now? Dr. A. B. Bruce has this to say in answer to such a question: "In our day incorporating union on a great scale is not possible and other methods of expressing the feelings of Catholicity must be resorted to ("The Training of the Twelve," p. 460); and then suggests that the method of confederation might be tried. "But whatever may be thought of this," he continues, "one thing is certain, that the unity of believers in Christ may be made more manifest as an undeniable fact somehow, if the Church is to realize her vocation as a holy nation called out of darkness to show forth the virtue of Him whose name she bears, and win for Him the world's homage and faith."—(*Idem.*)

be conquered. A Greek general, standing upon an eminence from which he could see the whole army of hostile troops, cried out to his soldiers: "Men, courage! Victory is ours! for I see that the spears in the files of the enemy are not in line. The ranks yonder are so illy trained that their weapons will become sources of suicide before the sun shall set." Keep your spears in line, Oh! various regiments of the Church of Christ, and victory is yours! Satan wants nothing better than to stir up strife among denominations; he's safe then, and what more can then easily lead the people of God captive. Just as were two boys who were treed by a vicious bull-dog.* Comrades chancing to come by, were hailed to the rescue. A whole regiment of boys, however, would not have been sufficient to remove Tiger from his watch. But the shrewdness of a boy soon came into play. A vicious bull was grazing in an adjoining field. Stealthily the boys crept up to the gate between fields, and with a crashing noise let down the bars. The bull, hearing the noise, came to see what it meant, and, finding the bars down, of course, entered the next field. "Holler! Holler at Tige! Set him barkin'! that will make the bull come. Then you'll see fun; and you can get away, too," shouted the comrades to the prisoners. The dog barked furiously, and the bull went to see what had interested Tiger. Soon the dust flew amid bellowing and barking. The boys in the tree were entirely forgotten by the brutes in the interest they had in a battle of their own, and soon reached the ground. They stood at a safe distance in great glee watching the fight. And splendid umpires did they make! At last, fearing that the bull would be killed or the dog die, the boys prepared to stop the fight. They saw that both brutes were exhausted, and that themselves had little to fear; so they got immense whips and sticks and began to whip the dog and beat the bull to separate them. Both animals were powerless, if not without courage; and beneath whip and stick the tired creatures separated and were driven each to his home. And each one seemed to wonder at

* Related by the Rev. J. A. Davis in *Christian Intelligencer*.

the mastery gained over him by the boys. The Church of to-day but too often, alas! alas! has no more sense and shrewdness than these brutes; her branches, at the instigation of Satan, attacking each other, and thus let his Satanic majesty free to lead her captive. Knowing that he could not conquer her himself, he sets the denominations fighting each other, till, all exhausted and weary, he can easily gain victory over her. The coming ideal Church will have sense enough not to let the devil down from the tree by her internecine wars. "One thing seems clear—that the unification of the Church cannot be accomplished by one denomination working upon another from without.* Proselytism, whether by argument or persuasion, is a waste of time and strength. The converts made by such means are far-fetched and little worth." †

II. Look further at the coming ideal Church as to *membership*.

1. *First of all as to purpose, aim and ultimate end of all their work.*—This will not be so much the swelling of membership rolls, so as to make good showings in "Church news" columns of religious papers, at Associations and Conventions, and Presbyteries, and Classes, and Synods, as the true conversion of people from meanness of character, and sinfulness of heart and awakening in their life and conduct noble, Christ-like impulses. Nor will it be a gathering into the Church merely those who wear gold rings and goodly apparel, and who live in fine stone-front homes of our fashionable up-town communities, whose religion consists mainly in driving in glitter-

* Dr. Bruce (*Training of the Twelve*, p. 461) says that the prayer of Jesus in John 17 "plainly conveys the truth that without unity the Church can neither glorify Christ, commend Christianity as divine, nor have the glory of Christ abiding on herself. . . . Wrangling is not a divine thing, and it needs no divine influence to bring it about. Any body can quarrel; and the world, knowing that, has little respect for a quarreling Church. But the world opens its eyes in wonder at a community in which peace and concord prevail, saying: Here is something out of the common course—selfishness and self-will rooted out of human nature—nothing but a divine influence could thus subdue centrifugal forces which tend to separate men from each other."

† H. J. Van Dyke, D.D., "The Church, Her Ministry and Sacrament" p. 71.

g equipages to the Sabbath morning service and pay large w rents, while the poor who live in squalor and in crime in nement rows are left to their sad fate; but it will be a pro- ding a common church home for all alike who desire to wor- up God.

2. *As to reasons for being members.*—This will not be because ey had reasoned out upon a basis of utilitarianism that it is fest to be in the Church, and hence make religion a place of rsonal refuge; or because they had been driven to the Lord, ving had awakened in them “the trembling of a craven spirit anticipation of tortures;” but because they are religious for igion’s sake, and have been driven to the Saviour because re had been awakened in them the agonies of a nobler rit “in the horrors of *being* evil;” and with impulses of love ging them to deeds of mercy and kindness. They will not m be those whose fellow-feeling ends in mere sentimental y, that doles out a dollar or two to the poor and suffering as one is thrown in sheer compassion to a hungry dog; not se “who sigh for wretchedness, yet shun the wretched, nurs- in some delicious solitude ‘Their dainty loves and slothful npathies;’” nor those who are but “dreaming contempl-,” who are always sighing and looking for conditions of ater ease and pleasure; but it will be those who make sor- r smile, dry the tears of grief and sadness bedewing the pale, ohed cheek of humanity, and smooth dying pillows. They l, further, be those who believe, and then act upon the belief, t “the best Christian is not the one who *longs* most for even, but the one who is doing the most to transform the irts and lives and homes of men into heaven;” and who lize that “there is something better than singing hymns of alah-land above, the Sweet By and By, and quoting texts m the gates and walls of the New Jerusalem,” knowing that t something is “revealing the celestial song in a godly, busy”; and, again, those who know that “heaven comes now and l be fully unveiled to those who gain it by fidelity everywhere l always in the conquest of the Redeemer.”

3. *As to exemplification of practical Christianity.*—The membership of the coming ideal Church will consist of people whose religion at home and in business will be just as good and true and transparent as in the church service, or at prayer-meeting. A boy of a church member of the coming ideal Church will not have occasion to say, as did one to a railway conductor when asked his age: "At home I'm always twelve, but mother says I'm only ten in the cars." In the ideal Church there will not be the scene described in the "*Sunday-School Times*," where a slovenly carpenter was once heard at a weekly prayer-meeting to pray with great fervency for the spread of Christ's cause—a cause which he disgraced and hindered in his sphere every time he stood at his work-bench. When he ended his prayer a hearty "Amen" came from a servant who put her mistress out of temper a hundred times a day by her carelessness. A clerk also was there, who, although he taught a class in the mission-school on Sundays, was always late at his employer's store week-days. He whispered "Amen" too—and meant it, so far as he knew himself. A lady hearer, as she listened, resolved to join the Church missionary society, and then went home and found unreasonable fault with her cook. And others also felt warmed to do something for Christ who never seemed to have thought that religion, like charity, begins at home.

The membership of the coming ideal Church will be different from that of a father concerning whom his boy answered when asked: "Is your father a Christian?" "Yes, sir, but you can't tell it on him; he ain't working at it lately, neither."

The membership of the coming ideal Church will be such as will make religion "glorified morality, and morals realized religion;" such as will know that it is an absurdity for any man to have "his heart full of loyal affection and devotion to God as an individual while engaged in private business, and then be perfectly oblivious of the existence and of the claims of God as soon as he begins to act politically as a citizen of the State;" clasping hands with the political tricksters, sharing the profits

with the "boodlers," being hail-fellow-well-met with the liquor traffic by giving it his moral support by voting for its men, even though it be on the plea that they happen to be the men of the party with which he is connected. It will be a membership loyal to the King of Kings in whatever capacity or in whatever circumstances they may be placed.

4. *As to willingness to work.*—The membership of the coming ideal Church will be such as is willing to work with large-hearted charity,—working for Christ either in personal ministrations, or by gifts for the cause,—and working not for the outwitting of their neighbors, in outward show, but who are willing to work for the upbuilding of Christ's glorious kingdom in the growth of grace in the hearts of believers, "till they all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that they may be no longer children tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men in craftiness, after the wiles of error; but speaking the truth (or dealing truly) in love may grow up in all things unto Him, which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth according to the working in due measure of each several part maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."*

5. And once more. Dr. Pierson predicts that the coming Church, as far as work for the extension of Christ's kingdom is concerned, will be essentially a missionary Church distinctively educating her membership to intelligent and systematic participation in the work of witnessing to all men. "No member will be in good standing who takes no part in this loyal obedience to Christ's last command." He suggests further, that each church will have a double pastorate, one at home and one abroad, "the support of both provided for as equally a part of the financial administration of the church;" and adds: "We see no reason why denominations should not act in concert to promote great

* Eph. 4: 13-16, R. V.

common ends, and save all the needless outlay now involved in separate action and administration." *

III. Consider, thirdly, the coming ideal Church as to the *ministry*.

1. The ministry must be thoroughly equipped *intellectually*.

Why? For the following manifest reasons :

(a) Because the ages are growing more and more intellectual; and this must be so the more pure Christianity is disseminated.

Dr. James Freeman Clark has well said : "Christianity blossoms out into modern science, literature, art,—children who, indeed, often forget their mother and are ignorant of their source, but which are still fed from her breasts and partake of her life. Christianity, the spirit of faith, hope and love, is the deep fountain of modern civilization. Its inventions are for the many, not for the few. Its science is not hoarded, but diffused. It elevates the masses who everywhere else have been trampled down. The friend of the people, it tends to free schools, a free press, a free government, the abolition of slavery, war, vice and the melioration of society." †

He who would essay to lead the people in their religious worship and thought must, therefore, of necessity be, to say the least, abreast of them, if not in advance. 'Tis, however, question how far the preacher is called upon to go in the way of intellectual preaching. People truly do not go to the house of God on the Sabbath day to hear abstract essays on worldly science and philosophy, and "culture" as it is called in our

* *The Missionary Review of the World*, Oct., 1891, p. 725. The above excerpts are taken from Dr. Pierson's characteristic article on *The Coming Age of Missions*, in which are found many excellent hints as to what the coming Church, if she attains to the true spirit of her Master, must develop into, not only in the line of work abroad but also at home, expressing deep solicitude 'to see the Church taking up the cause of the Master as though there were faith in His leadership and confidence in the ultimate triumph of the Gospel. . . . The world waits and He waits for a new spirit of thorough surrender to His will, and for a new epoch of enterprise in missions. How long shall this waiting of ages be in vain ? "

† "Ten Great Religions," Vol. I., p. 30, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1883.

day; but they come to sit beneath the droppings of the sanctuary to have their souls refreshed and purified by a simple, clear, practical gospel, such as Jesus preached in the Sermon on the Mount and at Jacob's well, and to the multitudes that sat on Judean slopes to hear it. There is significant suggestion in what Dr. Theodore Cuyler relates concerning one of his first congregations. He writes: "During my first ministry in a suburban town I had in my little congregation a very distinguished lawyer for a part of each year. He once said to me: 'The two things I want are simplicity in preaching and downright earnestness. My brain is taxed all through the week with the exacting labors of my profession, and I do not come to God's house to have it taxed again with any intricate questions; I come here simply to be made a better man.'"

People surely do not and never will, no matter what the intellectuality of the world may become, want their ministers to undertake the useless task of arming themselves with "sling and stone, and go forth to meet the Lilliputian Goliaths who defy the armies of the living God." They truly do not and never will expect them to grapple with and unfold the categories of Kant and the vague philosophy of Hegel, that resulted in the idealism of a Fichte, landing at last in the nescience and agnosticism of a Spencer of to-day. They certainly do not and never will ask them to spend the sacred time in the pulpit in attempts to explain and combat the ever-varying destructive, unsettled and unsettling biblical criticism of a Tübingen-school type on the New Testament, and that of a Wellhausen and Kuenen, echoed by a Robertson Smith and a Briggs on the Old Testament. They, indeed, do not and never will care to have them enter upon the useless task of expounding the Positive Philosophy and Mr. Herbert Spencer's system of the universe, "developed from the unknowable, and his new theory of creation under Darwin's law of development." Nor would they now or ever have them "follow Tyndal and Huxley and Darwin into the *penetralia* of nature and expose the missing links in their theories of the origin of man and of the universe,

and trudge with Sir John Lubbock over his immeasurable mud-bank of facts, often falsely so called, or grope their way with Berra Gould through his immeasurable fog-banks of speculation touching the genesis of man and his religions." *

The people are, 'tis true, and 'tis as blessed as true, interested in scientific discussions when conducted in their time and place, and such discussions are very valuable; but worn and weary with the week's burdens and cares they do not come to a church on the Lord's Day to listen to them. And after all the fact is that very few outside of the specialists know much about the technicalities of scientific and philosophic discussion and can understand little of it all. Who, for example, can understand Herbert Spencer's definition of evolution, when he says that "it is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to definite coherent heterogeneity, through continuous differentiations and integrations." What does that mean? Who knows? Who particularly cares? The best elucidation of this language and as Dr. Gregory says, "bringing out the precise scientific import in the most intelligible form," † was given by a keen critic as follows: "Evolution is a change from a no-howish untal-
aboutable all-alikeness, to a somehowish and in-general-tal-
aboutablenot-all-alikeness, by a continuous something-elsifien-
tions and stick-togetherations."

A minister was in the midst of a series of scholarly Sabbath discourses on Huxley, Tyndal, Darwin and Spencer,—in no way disturbing the peace or affecting the reputation of these specialists by his generalities, almost, if not altogether meaningless,—when one of his members came to him and said: "My dear pastor, please preach to us Christ and Him crucified; we

* Dr. Stuart Robinson wrote in the January, 1879, *Princeton Review* "Every minister of intelligence has discovered that the most effective method of destroying the influence of error over the minds of men is not to give chase after it into the wilderness of controversy, but to instill into the minds of the people clear and distinct ideas of the contrary truth. The surest antidote to falsehood is clear-cut simple statement of the positive truth which falsehood assails."

† The "Princeton Review," Sept., 1878, p. 435.

don't know anything about the men concerning whom you are preaching, and what is more we don't care to know anything about them; our salvation does not depend upon them; it does depend upon Jesus our Saviour; we long to know of Him: tell us of Him who saves us."* Ah! yes, 'tis Christ we all want to know, and the Christian soul says:

"Tell me about the Master,
Of the wrongs He freely forgave;
Of His love and tender compassion,
Of His love that was mighty to save;
For my heart is weary, weary
Of the woes and temptations of life,
Of the error that stalks in the noonday,
Of falsehood and malice and strife.

Yet I know that whatever sorrow
Or pain or temptation befall,
The Infinite Master hath suffered
And knoweth and pitieth all.
So tell me the sweet old story
That falls on each wound like a balm,
And my heart that was bruised and broken,
Shall grow patient and strong and calm."

What is needed, then, is a ministry whose intellectuality will **not** consist in merely being able to write erudite discourses on **abstract** subjects, but who will combine in their preaching a **practical**, intense, lively, earnest, simple, spiritually-minded **presentation** of the Gospel, with a full appreciation of and ability in the learning of the day.

c) The ministry must be fully equipped intellectually, also **because** the cause demands it.

What subjects we have to deal with! God! Immortality!
The Atonement! Salvation of the Soul! Plans of Redemption!

*"My one great comprehensive answer then to the question, What is the **best** method of dealing in the pulpit with popular skepticism? is really this: **make** known and real to men by every means you can command the **personal** Christ, not doctrine about Him, but Him; strike at the tyranny of the **physical** life by the power of His spiritual presence." Phillips Brooks, D. D., in *Princeton Review*, March, 1879, p. 307.

can a weak intellect, or an untrained mind cope with these subjects in any way satisfactorily as a leader of the people in matters pertaining to them?

And further, do we entrust our sick bodies to the care of uneducated, unskilled, untrained physicians? Shall people entrust their sick and dying souls to the care of untrained, un-intellectual pastors?

2. But coupled with this high degree of intellectuality there must be a high degree of spirituality. The ideal ministry will be thoroughly endued with power from on high; fully consecrated to the service of God in saving souls; highly spiritually-minded; living constantly close to the heart of Jesus Christ the loving Master;—the intellectuality spoken of above warmed and made all aglow with attractiveness by a high spirituality. For unless the intellect is prompted by and filled with spiritualism in religion, the latter is unsatisfactory and very incomplete. Attractive to the eye such may be, but chilling to the touch and life, just as is the faultless statuary in our art galleries.

3. But take another trait that will be conspicuous in the ministry of the coming church, viz., *sincerity*.

In that church we will not hear charges that are but all too boldly made against the clergy of to-day, in many quarters—that they are not sincere; that they have not the courage of their convictions, and dare not speak out their full minds, either on doctrinal or practical subjects, for fear of losing their places and popularity; that they are afraid to utter the whole counsel of God, plain, unvarnished, practical truth; that by many of them creeds are privately discarded which they preach publicly. At the great council of Congregationalists held last year in London, a layman boldly uttered these scathing words to ministers gathered from all parts of the world: “The rich pay the piper and they select the tune, and the preacher is the victim or servant of the rich diaconate, rather than the servant of the Master.” * Of course, that charge is not indiscriminately true. If it is, good-by to all true church life; farewell

* Ben Tillett.

to the respect and confidence and love and following of recognized teachers in the church of Christ, such as is necessary, if they are to lead the world to God; gone is all bravery in the ministry. For in the words of another: "To do and say the right thing because it is right, to dare to gaze on the splendor of the naked truth without putting a veil before it to terrify any by mystery and vagueness,—to live by love and not by fear,—that is the life of a brave man who will take Christ and His mind for the truth, instead of the clamor either of the worldly world or of the religious world." * God save the clergy from cowardice! Amen! Phillips Brooks was right when he said: "These are no times for trimming. He is weak to-day who does not preach the highest spirituality to the materialist and the highest morality to the profligate. The unbelievers of to-day despise compromise, and love to hear the fullest truth." In the coming ideal church there will not be the slightest occasion for such a charge as Ben Tillett made, for her ministry will be sincere, brave, honest, realizing that

"One self-approving hour whole worlds outweighs
Of stupid starers and of loud huzzahs!;"

they will not seek for so-called popularity, and the applause of crowds, so much as for the approval of God and conscience in doing right for right's sake.

4. And further, the ministry of the coming ideal church will be large-hearted and charitable. There will be in it no petty jealousy; no envyings; no scampering for the rich churches; no jostling and crowding one another in unkindness;—but a charitable feeling towards each other that is helpful and encouraging to all; and a rejoicing in the successes of one another. The "elder-brotherliness," as found in the parable of the Prodigal Son, of enviousness and uncharitableness of character and disposition will not be known in this ministry. For as men grow broader in heart and cultured in mind, the less are they inclined to envy and the sooner does jealousy depart. Jealousy is common only among small men. Truly great men are

* F. W. Robertson.

not enemies of each other. In Grimm's *Life of Michael Angelo*,* we find a practical illustration of this. Calling attention to the contention and strife and jealousy among the disciples of Michael Angelo and of Raphael, Grimm writes: "Excellence forms an indissoluble fellowship between those who possess it. All great men, towering above the common multitude of mortals, feel themselves indissolubly united; their condition is not sufficient for them not to seek each other at any price. Around the two men (Michael Angelo and Raphael) envy and jealousy may have vented themselves in intrigues but in the high regions of their truest nature, each felt to keenly his own and the other's virtue; and separately as they remained outwardly considered, they yet stood close together because nothing sufficiently exalted to divide them reached the heights to which they had attained." Thus, in the excellence of a large-heartedness, in the elevation of a broad charity, will the ministry of the coming church stand close together, separately though they may remain outwardly, and nothing sufficiently exalted to divide them will reach the heights to which they will attain.

Let us hear in conclusion what one taught directly by the Holy Spirit saith concerning and to the true minister: "Faithful is the saying, If a man seeketh the office of a bishop (overseer—ἐπίσκοπος,) he desireth a good work. The bishop therefore must be without reproach; the husband of one wife, temperate, sober-minded, orderly, given to hospitality, apt to teach, no brawler, no striker; but gentle, not contentious, no love of money; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. . . . not a novice, lest being puffed up he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have good testimony from them that are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." † "I charge thee in the sight of God who quickeneth all things, and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession that thou keep the commandment without spot, without reproach

* Vol. I, p. 351.

† 1 Tim. 3: 1-7, R. V.

until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; which in its own times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power eternal, Amen." *

God grant that the day may speedily come when the ideal Church of the future will be the blessedly real Church of all time; and I feel like writing that if on this earth of ours it can never be realized, then let us pray that the new heaven and the new earth may soon come, so that the angel may show unto God's people the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God; her light like unto a stone most precious, as it were a jasper stone clear as crystal . . . and I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof. And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it; for the glory of God doth lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb. And the nations shall walk amidst the light thereof; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it, and the gates thereof shall in no wise be shut by day (for there shall be no night there) and they shall bring the glory and the honor of the nations into it; and there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean or he that maketh an abomination and a lie; but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." † "He which testifieth these things saith: Yea, I come quickly, amen. **Even** so, come, Lord Jesus." ‡

* 1 Tim. 6: 13-16, R. V.

† Rev. 21: 9-11 and 22-27, R. V.

‡ Rev. 22: 20.

Denver, Colo.

VIII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

A SURE STONE.

"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat : but I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not."—St. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

SECTION I.

Judas.

If, when He first met "Simon the son of Jonas," Jesus thought of the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone," did these, its concluding words, sink deep into His heart? "and he that believeth" (in this living stone) "*shall not make haste*;" * or, "shall not be confounded;" † or, "shall not be put to shame." ‡ This is now to be seen.

"Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him."

Never more keenly than when he made that bargain, and fulfilled that contract, did Judas feel that the Messiah was guiltless of any wrong whatever, and could boldly challenge His enemies—"Which of you convicteth me of sin?" And

* Isaiah, xxviii. 16.

† I Peter, ii. 6.

‡ R. V.—*Ibid.*

yet, strange as it may seem, Judas could not love this man. To him He was indeed "as a root out of dry ground," having "no form or comeliness," and "no beauty that he should desire him." He loved Him not, for the same reason that many hated Him. The spotless life of Jesus was a constant rebuke to them. And the Master knew that Judas loved Him not, and would betray Him, for when the disciples confessed Him as "the Holy One of God," He showed no sign of joy, but abruptly said, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" His spirit was heavy under the knowledge that Satan would prevail with Judas to sin against his conviction, and afterwards destroy himself, soul and body.

True, Judas regretted his act of betrayal when he found it would lead to the Messiah's death, but his sorrow was purely selfish. The remorse which God's wrath had kindled in his breast burnt fiercely, and drove him to the chief priests and elders for relief. Pity for "the innocent blood" would have led him to the hall of judgment there to "cast down the pieces of silver," and confess his guilt and the Master's innocence. Or, this being denied, it would have forced him to the feet of Jesus to bewail his crime and implore forgiveness, and Judas, even Judas, might have been saved. But the betrayer never sought Him who for three years had been his constant companion and friend, to show contrition, or to ask forgiveness. The gentle reproof, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" had been powerless to touch his stony heart with compassion for the man; and the conviction, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood," was equally powerless to draw his unbelieving soul to the Lord. And so, when his burden became greater than he could bear, he hurried to the partners of his crime to undo his sin, and restore "the price of blood." But, finding they had neither the power nor wish to absolve him, he rashly took his life into his own hands. That sole and silver cord by which his Master would have held him—the conviction of his perfect sinlessness—and by which He would have drawn him to Him-

self, Judas madly and wilfully severed, and rushed, as Satan urged him, to his own destruction. He loved not, and therefore he "believed" not, and was "confounded" and "made haste," and was "put to shame."

"It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the LORD thy God," was the answer of Jesus when Satan cunningly endeavored to make Him take His life into His own hands by presumptuously casting Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. "And all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come," was the firm resolve of the sorely tried Job when many times tempted by Satan to "curse God and die." Jesus had respect to the commandments of God, and would not belie the divinity within Him; and Job, though dismayed that the hand of the LORD was against him, could hold fast to his faith and his integrity. Judas had neither. He feared not God, nor regarded man. He was destitute of love and pity. Whilst he might not rank with Jesus nor with Job, he could not follow the Christ, like Peter, to His trial, nor like John into the judgment hall, nor even stand with His acquaintances "afar off." Not once did he place himself within sight of the Master, where His compassionate eyes might at least rest upon him—eyes which Judas knew were as forgiving as His blood was innocent, and which, had they beheld his anguish, might have commanded his tormentor, Though "he is a devil," he is also a man, and in the name of humanity I bid thee, "Let him go."

Instead of following the "Master" whom he had so officiously hailed and kissed—instead of placing himself within sight of Jesus, under whose eyes alone the sinner is safe, whether from the power of sin and Satan, or, what is still more fearful, the wrath of God, Judas took his doom upon himself and chose to "make haste." The eyes that could bring Peter to repentance with a look, and which might by a glance have forgiven him, he shunned; and the lips which prayed for His "betrayers and murderers," and might have prayed for him too, the chief of them all—the lips he had

once eagerly sought for betrayal—Judas never again desired to kiss, either in peace or penitence.

The Scripture says, "He went and hanged himself;" "and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." They recorded this last circumstance of his miserable end with as much precision as if it had been suggested by the fact that he had no pity, or "bowels of compassion," for the innocent and helpless Messiah, and received therefor the exact reward of his hardness of heart.

SECTION II.

Peter.

Peter, on the contrary, both believed in and loved the Master, and, though he forsook Him and fled when He was apprehended in the garden, yet, after the confusion of the moment had subsided, he turned and followed Him to the palace of the high priest. Here he stood "at the door," longing to enter, till John, who had also returned and followed Jesus, came out, and, by gaining him admittance, innocently led his friend into the very net of temptation; for this was the place where Satan had chosen to make his assault upon Simon. Desirous as much to wound and insult the Messiah, as to obtain possession of the chief disciple, he had maliciously determined that Peter should deny Him in His greatest extremity, and, if possible, before His face. This overthrow was not to be wrought in a corner. Publicly Simon had made his confession that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of the living God, and publicly he was, virtually, to retract it. And the means Satan employed to bring this about was, as has been seen, Simon's Jewish horror of the cross.

"To prison and to death" Peter had affirmed he was willing to follow the Lord, and this much had affirmed truly; for he was brave and devoted. In defence of Jesus he did not hesitate to strike the servant of the high priest, though making himself thereby amenable to the law; nor did he basely

flee at having wounded him by the stroke. He may have shrunk from physical suffering, (as who does not?) but he was not a coward. After Pentecost he went boldly to prison, and chained to the guards, slept there so soundly that it was necessary for "the angel of the Lord," who came with a shining light, to smite him on the side and lift him up. It is true that the word of Christ stood between him and *early* death (and death by crucifixion, as by that time he knew) but Herod was cruel. The whole church was praying for him "without ceasing," so imminent was his danger, and yet he slept so profoundly that his deliverer was obliged to bid him, "Arise up quickly!" and then, as for one who is but half awake, further direct him how to dress. Little was Peter quaking at the fact of actual imprisonment, and the prospect of cruel torture.

It was only when Jesus refused defence in the garden that all the disciples forsook Him, and then they fled because He surrendered, and perhaps because He had said, "Let these go their way." Simon was prepared to follow the Lord to the end, but he was also ready for active resistance, and not for tame submission. No more than the "multitude, who came out with staves and swords against him," did he expect to see the Messiah peacefully yielding at the outset, and His conduct in this respect was an enigma to him. He knew that Jesus was mortal, for he had seen Him suffer, and he knew that the Jews were desirous to kill Him; but he expected He would always avoid His enemies, or elude them by miracle, or perhaps allow His disciples to fight for Him. On death, then, for the sake of the Lord, or with their Lord, if unavoidable, Peter had counted and was ready, sword in hand.

But Simon had not counted on what, to his overwhelming surprise, he discovered a little later—that their Master's death was to be by crucifixion, and that on Jesus' part both the dying and the crucifying were to be voluntary! These possibilities had never entered into his reckoning. It is true the Messiah had hinted at them, but such hints he had accepted

as mere figures of speech, for crucifixion, alas ! was, unknown to himself, the very weakness of Peter's soul. Of all the disciples, and, next to Jesus Himself, he abhorred most the death by hanging. Stoning, beheading, burning—any martyr's death he could endure—but not the "hanging on a tree." That was not the death of a martyr, but of a traitor—a traitor to his country and his God—and hence the most infamous death a man could die. All the instincts of a true man and a proud heart rose against the thought of such a death ; and these instincts were Simon Bar-Jona's. A temptation like David's would never have prevailed with him ; nor could any bribe have bought him. "Silver and gold" were of little account to the man who scorned to "sell the gift of God for money ;" and just as little would the cry of "prison and death" have availed to make him deny the Lord ; but the shout of "*Crucify Him,*" "*crucify Him,*" Satan knew would be the death-knell to his constancy and courage ; and with this fear of crucifixion, he meant to, and did, cast him down from his height as the most exalted of the apostles.

SECTION III.

The Offence of the Cross.

TO those who are born and reared in the Christian Church, the name "Jesus" is a household word, dearer than the name father or mother, husband, wife or child ; and so the cross is equally revered. But with those who were born under the shadow of the tabernacle and temple it was very different. To the Jews "the cross," or as they called it, "the tree," was a synonym for all that was fearful to imagine and dreadful to experience. What made it so was, that "if a man had committed a sin worthy of death," and he was "put to death," according to the legal penalty, he was in some cases *afterwards* hung upon a tree. He not only died "without," or outside of "the camp," as typical of being cut off from the congregation of Israel, but his body was afterwards taken and

hung on a tree to signify that the whole man—body, soul and spirit—was “accursed of God.” There it was left till sunset, as a terror perhaps to like evil-doers, when it was taken down, lest it should defile the land; and then it was (like the body of Judas in the potter’s field) buried in unhallowed ground.

The Messiah’s case differed from this in many respects. He received His death *by* hanging on the cross, and not in some other way before. Being guiltless of blasphemy—the only show of a charge the Jews could bring against Him—they found it impossible to kill Him by stoning, which was their appointed death for that particular sin.* *Hanging* was indeed lawful with them, but it was only so *after* death,† not *before*. Hence they resorted to Roman law to gain their end. The Jews provided the innocent victim. The Gentiles furnished the illegal mode. Each was to be responsible for the crucifixion of “that just man,” who was thus to become the propitiation for their sins, and not of theirs only, but of “the whole world,” which was alike “guilty before God.” The Messiah was also, according to the law, removed before sunset, but He was taken reverently down and buried in consecrated ground. His body hallowed the land.

By the exposure on a tree of a criminal already dead, God signified that he was cursed by Him, and that men concur in it; and only by Christ’s endurance of it could the curse be cancelled. It was the fruit of the forbidden tree that brought sin and death into the world, and cut man off from God; and until the tree had borne Fruit of quite another kind, of which the world might eat and live again, God had declared “Curse is every one that hangeth on a tree.”‡ The full knowledge and mystery of the Messiah’s death after this fashion, and the atonement for the sins of mankind, had been carefully hidden from the church and the world, as had also been hidden the full mystery of His person, for both could only be re-

* Lev. xxiv. 16.
Crucifixion.

† Deut. xxi. 22, 23. Also Smith’s “Bible Dictionary,” Art. 3
‡ Deut. xxi. 23; Gal. iii. 13.

vealed as they were accomplished in His actual advent and death. In this death, then, the Jews saw no salvation. To them it was "outer darkness," and as such they justly dreaded it. This was the keen edge of David's sorrow, when "he cried with a loud voice," "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" for David's foreboding soul saw his rebellious and usurping son caught and held, through the judgment of God, by the branches of the fatal tree, as well as pierced by the cruel darts of Joab.

At the time of the Messiah's advent, suffering had also been significantly added to the "shame" of the tree, by its being formed in the shape of a *cross*. However, from a political point of view, its *infamy*, far more than its shame, which He "despised," and its suffering, which He "endured," bore down the loyal Son of David, and made Him sink under the burden of carrying His cross. He had been born the Hebrew of the Hebrews, and lived, as touching the law, blameless as to both its spirit and its letter. To the corrupt scribes and Pharisees, because they sat "in Moses' seat" he had shown respect, and taught His disciples to do the same. Of the existing government, He had said, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;" and, to the high priest, with almost His last breath, He could answer, "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing." To Him who was the only true scion of David and rightful heir to the Jewish throne, and who for His people's highest good had steadily refused His own crown, what grief it must have been to be tried as a rebel to authority, a destroyer of order, a seditious person and an insurrectionist, and in dying be mocked as a pretender and usurper! Well might He cry by the lips of the prophet, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the LORD hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger."

SECTION IV.

Some Truth in the Accusation of the Jews.

This infamy was the more bitter to Christ, inasmuch as there was ultimate truth in the accusations which the Jews brought against Him. "This Jesus of Nazareth" had come to abolish the rites, or "change the customs which Moses delivered" them, as they complained, though neither He nor His first martyr, Stephen, told the people this in so many words, as the suborned false witnesses accused them both of doing. But this was a consequence which would necessarily flow from His teachings; and hence Jesus was silent when the high priest asked, "What is it which these witness against thee?" The Jews were quick reasoners, and they saw directly that Christ's spiritualizing of the law would render its rites unnecessary, and so they stirred up the common people against Him by laying before them that which would be the result of His teachings, as though He had really taught it, while this result, put into the mouths of the false witnesses, naturally made them, when persisting in their accusations, disagree as to the precise form of His words. That same spiritualizing of the law, St. Stephen, in his grand historic address, afterwards showed them was intended from the beginning, and destined to cover the whole world with its blessings, for which frank and fearless utterances he immediately received the crown of martyrdom.

Jesus of Nazareth did tell the woman of Samaria that the time was coming "when neither in that mountain nor yet at Jerusalem should men worship the Father" (with outward rites and ceremonies), but that the true worshippers should worship Him (everywhere) in "spirit and in truth." And He did intimate to the Jews that He had come to set aside their peculiar services of the law and predictions of the prophets; though at the same time He assured them, emphatically, it was to be done, not by destroying, but by fulfilling them.

The law and the prophets, however, the Jews did not wish to have fulfilled. The abolishing of the ceremonial law, particularly, would destroy their distinctive nationality; and against this destruction they labored hard, and to avoid it the high priest said it were better that one man should die for the people, than the whole nation perish. They were secretly angry with Jesus for saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." He who could speak thus was no true Son of David, and no true friend of the throne of David. Their government was slipping only too fast out of their hands; and it exasperated them to see the lineal descendant and acknowledged heir of David quietly submit to Roman usurpation. He was altogether too cosmopolitan for their plans, politically, as well as religiously. As a prophet who ought to know the hearts of all men, He compromised Himself by associating with publicans and sinners; and, as a Jew who should have regarded all outside of His own nation as "dogs" and "unbelievers," He offended them by His liberal opinions and world-wide sympathies. Therefore they condemned Him; and it was hard, as hard for Jesus as for any other man to be put to death for being in advance of the age. And more particularly trying was it for Him, because He had not, in this respect, a single follower who sympathized with Him, the apostles, even, looking only for the kingdom to be restored to "*Israel*."

He had come to restore the kingdom of God to the whole world! He, the second Adam, was to restore it to all mankind! and hence, as mortal, He had never called Himself "the Son of David," but only and always "the Son of man." It was a sore trial, then, for Jesus to be condemned on account of these things by good men like Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus, the teacher of Israel, who, for fear of the Jews, came to Him by night. For no doubt many earnest souls in the Sanhedrin, following the opinion of the high priest, gave their verdict against Jesus of Nazareth solely to preserve the nation. They were the guardians of the law, and

the upholders of the commonwealth, and a king who would not take his own throne, especially when the life of the nation was at stake, and he the sole living heir, was guilty of treason and worthy of death. Therefore they hung the Son of David, ostensibly as a rebel to the existing powers, who "said that he himself is Christ a king," but in reality as a contemner of and a traitor to His own crown. This was the obloquy He died under politically; for the Messiah gave His people no reason for refusing the government which it was prophesied "should be upon his shoulder," except the incomprehensible one—"My kingdom is not of this world."

But this was not the deepest bitterness of His death. He was to die actively, as well as passively; was not only to "hold His peace," and "open not His mouth," but to assert and confess, and testify, and in so doing give His enemies that power over His life which they could not otherwise obtain. By this testifying, the head of the Jewish church was to die condemned as a blasphemer of Jehovah by its unanimous voice. This testimony, which would have put honor on their temple, and, in closing its gates, have covered it with dignity and glory, caused Him to die away from that temple and its ritual, as a rejecter and destroyer of them. It cut Him off from the church, and sent Him outside of the gate and of the camp to die as an unholy thing on unholy ground, and the death, too, that was stamped with the concurring curse of God and man. He who had come for no other purpose than "to do the will of the Father," and who had done that will nobly and perfectly, died before the eyes of all men, acknowledged by His own lips to be forsaken of God! In short, He died for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews. But He has His reward. His name has become "great" among them, as He prophesied it should: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the Gentiles."

be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts." The name of Jesus, accursed by the Jews, is, by the Gentiles, elevated to that of Jehovah, and adored by them as the name of their Saviour and their God.

But, at the time, even those first and lesser contradictions were very bitter to Jesus, the innocent. Only "for the joy that was set before Him," the joy of becoming a Saviour for all mankind, could He endure that first humiliation, of which Peter, alone, was called personally, and as the representative of the church, to partake with the Lord. Of the second and infinitely weightier cross, that death of deaths—"the wrath of God" for all men's sins—none of the righteous but Jesus shall ever know.

SECTION V.

Simon Crucified.

Such was the cost, incalculable, at which the Lord ransomed the earth and the world. But that in this suffering there was any redemption, Simon Bar-Jona knew not. The significance and virtue of the Messiah's death upon the tree, had not yet been discovered by the Jews, though the thicket of shrubs had caught and held the ram that saved Isaac, and the tree thrown into the bitter waters of Marah had made them sweet and nourishing. The light of Heaven had not yet been shed upon the cross. From the church and the world its glory was hidden, and to Simon's sight, as to that of all others, only the curse of God hung over it, and the blackness of hell gathered round it. Just as there was no beauty in Jesus, that Judas "should desire him," so there was no attraction in His cross for Simon. This death was without hope. No joy was set before Peter to enable him to endure it, except the joy of dying thus with the Master, and for that his love was not strong enough. "The customs of Moses," the religion of the prophets, and the church of his fathers, were dearer to him than the man

whom he had confessed as the Christ and the Son of the living God. And, therefore, at each inquisitive and separate remark of the servants—

“Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee.”

“Art thou not also one of his disciples?”

“Did I not see thee in the garden with him?”—

Peter's heart sank lower and lower; for with each interrogation, Satan made him believe that by adhering to Jesus Nazareth, this death would surely be his. He showed him (and crosses were many) that, as the chief disciple, he would certainly be crucified with Jesus, and die a recreant too, as Jesus was dying an apostate from the faith of Israel; and of course Simon the Jew fell rapidly from the truth, and denied with all his strength that he knew “the man,” “Jesus which is called Christ.”

During that time of trial Peter endured an agony of fear and dread. The strongest expressions that can come from men in the extremity of torture burst from his lips; and who probably had never sinned against the letter of the law found, to his dismay, that when tried to the utmost he could curse and blaspheme. Truly the bodily labor of Simon the Cyrenian who, toiling, bore the weight of the cross on his back, when Jesus sank under His cross, was nothing to the labor in spirit of Simon the Galilean, when he bore the burden of it on his heart, and fell because of it! fell, as Jesus prophesied he would, when on referring to His own martyrdom by crucifixion He said, “*Whither* I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards.”

It was indeed the death, like His own, upon the tree, so decreed by them both, which the Messiah had appointed for Peter. But hasty in fear, as he was ardent in love, Simon rushed to the cross before he was called; and having neither strength nor grace to bear it, he died before his time. Had he but known enough to see it, that last command in the garden—“Let these go their way,” was the Master's pledge to him that no other man nor woman nor child should harm him

That was His divine, as "I have prayed for thee" was His human warrant, that not a hair of his head should be hurt. Had Peter held fast to the truth, without regard to consequences, he would have found, to his joy, after the trial was over, that he had not denied the Lord, and, to his amazement, that the storm had passed by and he was unhurt. Jesus had other work for him to do than die for Him then and there, and the maids and servants would have dropped him with a jeer; for only Satan and the Messiah knew the real value of his life to the infant church. Had he obeyed God, and refused at all hazards to "bear false witness," those great billows of fear, though they rolled over him, would have left him unharmed; but he "of little faith" forgot to cry, "Lord, save me," and this time he sank down, down under the waves, many fathoms deep.

But Simon also died that day to sin and self-righteousness. "He that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin," are his own words. From that place of trial he went forth another man. Sin had been exposed and crucified in him, and now the Messiah's promise to convert and make him a thorough Christian would be rapidly fulfilled, for henceforth Peter's motto was, "We must obey God rather than man." Though not in the sense he imagined, he had indeed died with the Lord.

SECTION VI.

Satan's Mistake.

The desire of the enemy had been gratified—to sift the soul of the first confessor as wheat. Keen-eyed Satan, to detect the weakness of Peter's heart, and quick-witted, to aim his blow at its most vulnerable point! Malicious devil, to draw him to the feet of Jesus and make him deny Him there! Foolish devil, to place him where by a glance from the Lord he could be rescued! to cut him off from any help of God or man, in the face of God *and* man, the true and only helper! Stupid Satan, to expose his prey just where he could lose it,

waiting, suffered the will of God to be done upon him. But having feared that at the climax of his trial Simon would be overcome by despair, and so be completely "confounded," "the Lord"—who alone knew, and had experienced, the depths of Satan's craftiness—"the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter," in order that he might not be driven by the tempter to further iniquity. "And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept."

The enemy of Jesus and His confessor, on the contrary, hoped that, when realizing the extent of his sin, Simon, like Judas, would "make haste" to destroy himself; for no more in his case than in Job's did he care for the command, "Spare his life." When soiled with the mire of sin, and chilled by the breath of despair, the devil expected Simon to become the ready victim of his fell intent. And so he undoubtedly would, had not "the Lord *turned and looked.*" These last two voluntary and deliberate acts of the Messiah (in addition to His praying for him) fully disclose that Simon's life was the ultimate object which Satan had in view when asking for him; and they also prove that, without them, he would have been lost, and that by them he was saved. He had now gone so far in the direction of Judas that he could not appeal for help to God, nor to Christ. The Master knew that His unhappy disciple was paralyzed, and, quick as the opportunity offered, He turned toward him, and the divine magnetism of His gaze causing Peter slowly to raise his head, their eyes met in that long and earnest look, which thrilled them when they first beheld each other. "And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter went out, and *wept bitterly.*"

In that second, searching look, the new life within him was reclaimed from death, and, with it, the slain consciousness of the Christian, feeble as it had been, was revived.

But this time other features were added to it. It was now marked with conviction of sin, repentance, and forgiveness. Simon was so far restored to the fellowship of the apostles, that he could again walk with them, and run with John to the grave of Jesus, at the startling news brought by the women that it was empty.

“And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter”—that is, the LORD eternal, whom Simon alone had confessed. *His* look broke the Serpent's fatal charm, thawed the stony horror of his victim, and sent the warm blood once more tingling through all his veins. *His* look provoked Simon's repentance, and bathed him in a flood of bitter tears; and those bitter tears made the son of Christ so distasteful to the monster that he recoiled in haste and left him. He left him, however, only to return again with another and a more subtle temptation, when his deliverer should have retired in person from the field; for of all these wondrous sons of man and God, who, he felt were coming against him into the world under the conduct of Jesus, who had proved Himself invincible, Satan feared and hated most the first-born—“Simon surnamed Peter.”

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE GENESIS OF GENESIS: A Study of the Documentary Sources of the First Book of Moses in Accordance with the Results of Critical Science, illustrating the Presence of Bibles within the Bible. By Benjamin Wisner Bacon. With an Introduction by George F. Moore, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Hartford: The Student Publishing Company. 1892. Price, \$2.50.

What is meant by the Science of Higher Criticism? And what effect will the practical application of this Criticism to the Old Testament Scriptures have upon them and upon religious doctrine and faith? These are questions which at this time claim the attention not only of scholars, but of all intelligent and well-educated persons. To enable its readers to give a proper answer to these questions is the purpose of the volume before us. In its pages its author endeavors "to present to all classes of Bible students, in churches, in Sunday-schools, academies and other institutions of learning, as well as to the general public, that which might be expected to be gained from a course of lectures on the Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch, if delivered on one of the recently endowed university foundations for instruction in Biblical literature."

The book itself consists of three parts. The First Part, which is introductory, treats, in a plain and perfectly intelligible manner, of Higher Criticism and the Science of Documentary Analysis, of the Science of Historical Criticism, and of the Documentary Theory of to-day. In the Second Part we have the text of Genesis in the Revised Version, presented in varieties of type to exhibit the theory of documentary sources; with notes explanatory of the phenomena of redaction, and critical marginal references. In the Third Part we are given the documents J, E and P separately restored in a revised translation, with textual emendations of good authority. Finally we have two Appendices, which are made up respectively of the great Flood interpolations and connected passages, placed in juxtaposition with a translation of their cuneiform parallels, and of Hebrew notes.

The work throughout has been prepared with great care. It is clear, accurate, scholarly and thorough. Those who would acquaint themselves with the true character of the Higher Criticism and would put themselves in a position to form their own judgment as to how this criticism will affect the religious thought and life of the future should its results come to be generally accepted, will find this work an exceedingly serviceable one. The thanks of all who are interested in Biblical studies and in the religious movements of the day are truly due to the author for its preparation, and to

the publishers for the admirable form in which they have given it to the reading public.

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD UPON THE EARTH, Considered in its Historical, Chronological and Geographical Relations. By Samuel J. Andrews, Author of "God's Revelations of Himself to Men." A New and Wholly Revised Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. Price, \$2.50.

It does not enter into the design of this book to consider the authorship of the Gospels or to discuss their inspiration, nor to explain our Lord's discourses or parables, nor to inquire into the nature of his miraculous works. On the contrary it assumes that the Gospels are genuine historical documents and true statements of facts, and it deals with the life of the Lord on the earth in its chronological, topographical and historical relations only. It was first published just thirty years ago. It at once commanded the respect of scholars, and has retained it throughout all these years. During this time, however, much study has been devoted to the life of Christ, and much has been added to our knowledge of the Holy Land. In the present edition of the work, which is new and wholly revised, the facts brought to light by this study and by recent discoveries are all embodied, and thus its value has been greatly increased. In the form in which it is now given to the public, it indeed presents the results of the best scholarship down to the present time, and on this account merits special attention. It is a book which ought to have a place in the library of every minister and of every Sunday-school teacher. No other book with which we are acquainted so fully and yet so reverently sets forth the actual life of Jesus on earth, and so judiciously considers the various points concerning which there is an honest difference of opinion. For our part we should not like to be without it. For practical purposes we find it to be one of the very best of the many works on the Life of our Lord which during the last half century have been given to the public.

THE SERMON BIBLE: John iv.—Acts vi. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East 10th St., near Broadway. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

This volume of the Sermon Bible covers one of the most interesting and important portions of the New Testament Scriptures. The sketches of sermons which it contains are, accordingly, unusually instructive and suggestive. No one can read over them without being spiritually quickened and benefited, and ministers especially can scarcely help finding them of value to them. Those who have the preceding volumes of the series will, of course, want this also.

THE PREACHER AND HIS MODELS, The Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1891. By the Rev. James Stalker, D.D., author of "Imago Christi," "The Life of Jesus Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 E. 10th St., near Broadway. 1891. Price, \$1.50.

A volume of 284 pages, containing nine lectures and an appen-

dix. Some idea of the contents may be formed from the subjects of the separate lectures. 1. Introductory ; 2. The Preacher as a Man of God ; 3. The Preacher as a Patriot ; 4. The Preacher as a Man of the Word ; 5. The Preacher as a False Prophet ; 6. The Preacher as a Man ; 7. The Preacher as a Christian ; 8. The Preacher as an Apostle ; 9. The Preacher as a Thinker ; 10. Appendix, An Ordination Charge.

The author is from Glasgow, Scotland, and he has succeeded, we think, in marking out a somewhat new and original course in treating the general subject, following, as he does, some of the most distinguished divines of the age. As models he takes the Prophets as the preachers of the Old Testament and the Apostles as those of the New Testament. Whilst he by no means undervalues intellectual qualifications as highly necessary for the preacher, yet he significantly places the preacher as a *thinker* last in the series, indicating that moral and spiritual qualifications and character take precedence in the list. We can heartily endorse the positions taken in each lecture, but we think the title of the third lecture may, perhaps, not be clearly apprehended. It is true that the great inspired preachers of the Old and New Testaments exhibited a glow of patriotism in their preaching, as did even our Lord Himself, but we think their patriotism was something different from what is understood by the word in the present day. It was not so much merely love of country and nation as such that moved them, as love of a special, chosen people who were called by the Lord to hand down the true religion and prepare the way for the coming of Christ. As regards love in the way of preference of any one nation—as, for example, Greece or Rome—over other nations, the Scriptures say very little. It has, indeed, been questioned whether what is now commonly understood by patriotism in this sense is recognized in the Scriptures as a virtue. We do not believe it is a virtue, but it involves an element of selfishness when compared with that divine charity which recognizes no lines of separation among nations, but goes forth equally to all mankind as brethren of one common family. The patriotism of the Jews did become affected by a certain selfishness which had to be eradicated before they could take in the promises to Gentile as well as to Jew. It was not merely as a nation, as such in the ordinary sense, that the prophets loved their people, but as the medium of preparing the way for sending the Gospel to all nations.

But whilst there may be some misapprehension here as to the *title* of the lecture, the author in his *treatment* makes the subject clear. The preacher must have reference in his preaching, not only to the individual, but also to those organic orders of the social economy in the bosom of which the individual lives and unfolds his life. Virtue and vice, as social organic factors, must be regarded. But these organic factors are common to every nation, and while the

preacher should have interest in them because they are features of his own nation's life, yet his interest should regard them mainly as belonging to the economy of the whole family of man. In this view patriotism becomes subordinate to the broader virtue of philanthropy. Want of space prevents our expressing more adequately our thoughts on this point, but we trust the reader will be able to catch our meaning. It is regard for the organic forces and factors of the social economy that the lecturer has mainly in mind here by the term patriotism. Yet we would find it difficult to substitute a better title to the lecture.

These lectures take rank with the courses of able lectures that have in former years been delivered before the Yale Divinity School, and they merit a wide circulation and careful reading. Such lectures must certainly be a great advantage to any Theological Seminary. In the absence of a pecuniary foundation, might not a course be delivered gratuitously before our own seminary by one or another of our preachers, and in this way suggest provision of more extended character, by which eminent divines from other churches could be invited to give their services? Surely some of the Alumni of the seminary would be willing to return and give the benefit of their experience and study to the young men preparing for the ministry on the subject of Preaching the Gospel.

GOSPEL SINGERS AND THEIR SONGS. By F. D. Hemenway, D.D., and Charles U. Stewart, B.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, 80 cents.

This volume is a neat and interesting manual of the leading hymns of the ancient, mediæval, and modern church. It does not aim to give anything like an exhaustive treatment of Hymnology, but merely some report of the leading hymns of the ages. For those who have not made hymnology anything of a study, this manual will be found highly interesting, especially in introducing them to the classic hymns that have come down to us in translations from the ancient and mediæval church. It will be interesting to such readers also to know when and by whom the leading modern hymns, sung so frequently in all the churches, were composed. The work is written in a pleasing manner, and the publishers have presented it in the best style of the printer's art, so that it will make a graceful addition to any library. It should be found especially in all Sunday-school libraries, as the information it gives can scarcely fail to be interesting and instructive to young persons. Considering the excellent style of the book it is offered at an unusually low price.

BIBLE MIRACLES AND MODERN THOUGHT. By Prof. L. T. Townsend, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, 15 cents.

This is a little booklet of forty-eight pages. Its object is to vin-

dicte the Bible miracles and show their reasonableness over against the attacks of modern thought. First Prof. Townsend states the objections commonly made to the miracles of the Bible, and points out their inconclusiveness. He then seeks to defend the following propositions:

1. There is ample evidence that Bible miracles are probable, if they are possible.

2. There is conclusive evidence that Bible miracles actually were wrought, if they are possible.

3. There is overwhelming scientific evidence that Bible miracles are possible; therefore there is ample evidence that they are probable, and conclusive evidence that they actually were wrought.

His defense of these propositions is able and deserving of careful consideration. Whether it will carry conviction with it will depend on the moral and spiritual disposition of the reader. Dr. Townsend, however, shows conclusively, we think, that belief in the Bible miracles is not by any means irrational, but the very opposite.

THE STORY OF SODOM: A Biblical Episode. By W. C. Kitchin. Illustrated by W. P. Snyder. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Crans-ton & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.50.

The author of this volume has projected a series of biblical tales of which this is the first. The object of all these tales will be to portray, by the creation of imaginary personages and occurrences, the social, religious and political physiognomy of the times to which they relate. The present story, as is indicated by its name, has to do with the days of Abraham. It is well written, and will be found quite interesting as well as instructive. It makes an attractive book that is admirably suited to the Sunday-school library, and that ought to find a ready place in it.

HOMILIES OF SCIENCE. By Dr. Paul Carus. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1892. Price, \$1.50.

The purpose which underlies these homilies, the author gives us to understand in the preface to his work, "is to preach an ethics that is based upon truth, and upon truth alone." Truth, moreover, he defines as "a correct statement of fact," and as accordingly "demonstrable by the usual methods of science." His definition of truth we hold to be altogether too narrow, but accepting it as correct, we even find that these homilies fail to be in harmony with the principle announced. Thus, for instance, in the very first of them, the statement is set forth that "interest in theological discussions is nowhere to be found, not even in churches." Now our readers generally, we feel persuaded, will agree with us that this is not "a correct statement of fact," and that therefore inferences based on it are not "based upon truth, and truth alone."

These homilies, however, notwithstanding their defects, are well

written and scholarly, and will be found interesting and instructive, as showing the character of the new religion which a materialistic science offers, instead of the old. "We have," according to it, "no transcendental God, no illusory Ghost-immortality, no freedom that stands in contradiction to the law of causation. But we have the immanent God of a moral law in nature, we have the immanent immortality of a continuance of our soul-life beyond death, and the moral freedom of responsibility for our actions." "It is not," we are told, "the belief in an immortalized ego that can conquer death, but it is the surrender of this ego and all its egotistic desires." "Death," we are further told, "came into the world as the brother of birth, and death became necessary when birth, with its rejuvenescent power, lifted organic life one step higher in its evolutionary career, so as to allow a constantly renewed progress." After reading these homilies we are more than ever before convinced that the new religion which they advocate can never give to men the strength and peace and joy which are given them by the old. Christianity is something far better and higher than science, and especially than science as presented in this volume.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR. By Edwin Cone Bissell, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. The Hartford Theological Seminary. 1891. Price, \$1.75.

It is not an easy task to write a Hebrew Grammar for beginners. He who would successfully accomplish the task must combine many and varied qualifications. It is not enough that he should himself have a thorough knowledge of the language; he must also possess good judgment to determine what to introduce and what to omit, what to place in the text and what in the notes; he must have the literary ability to state principles clearly yet compactly; he must be capable of giving his matter a logical arrangement, so that each statement, as it occurs, shall be intelligible by itself, without reference to what is to follow; he must present a progressive series of exercises in translation from Hebrew into English, and from English into Hebrew, such that when the student shall have finished the books he will have a sufficient vocabulary to read historical prose at sight. How far Dr. Bissell, a good Hebrew scholar and a successful teacher, has met these requirements can only be determined by the practical use of his text-book in the class-room. Our first impression is generally favorable, but we confess to a fear that the beginner may, here and there, find himself unnecessarily confused. It has grown, the author tells us, out of his experience, and in his hands it doubtless works well; but whether another teacher, equally competent, would meet with as much success is a question which can be answered only after a fair trial. We commend the work to those who prefer the old method of grammar to the modern inductive method.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1892.

I.

THE DIVINE-HUMAN PERSON OF CHRIST.

BY REV. T. G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

THE difficulties in regard to the doctrine of the person of Christ circle around the conception of His personality. The definitions given by the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed and the creed of Chalcedon decided that Christ is divine and human; that His divinity is coequal with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit; that His humanity includes a human body, soul and spirit; that He has therefore two natures, divine and human; that these two natures remain distinct, though not separated, being united in one personality.

The most difficult point is that which concerns the character of His personality. This, it was said, is divine, the personality of the Logos, and therefore His humanity, it would seem, is without personality, *anhypostasia*. The difficulty here is to conceive of a complete humanity, including body, soul and spirit, and also a human will, as distinguished from a divine will, and yet not a human personality. Will is an attribute—

a necessary attribute—of personality. It is the *ego* that will; how then can there be a human will in Christ without a human personality?

The reason why there can be no human personality in Christ as urged against Nestorius, is because that would require the dualism of two persons in the one Christ, which, it was thought, would be a monstrosity. Christ is one person, not two persons. If He were two complete persons, then He would have to be a complete person from the Virgin Mary, which became joined then to His divine person afterwards, and that would destroy the mystery of His holy conception and birth. It is conceded that He was conceived and born without the agency of a human father, but if He were a complete human person, then He must have had a human father, and then also the divine might as well have joined itself to this human person after His birth—say at His baptism—as the Gnostics held. The union would not then have taken place in His conception, as it did, according to the Scriptures. And besides we would be confronted with the difficulty how two persons could live and act as one as our Lord did.

The difficulty then gathers itself up in this: How could there be a human will in Christ without a human *ego*, a human personality? I think the only solution of this difficulty is to grant that there is a sense, though not the sense of Nestorius, in which Christ has a human personality. We say, not in the sense of the theory of Nestorius, which required the dualism of two persons. What, then, can that sense be? In what sense can our Lord have a human personality without resulting in the monstrosity of being two separate and independent persons?

I answer in the sense that *the one divine personality of the Logos fills the place and acts in the capacity of a human personality.**

* If any one should feel that there is a lack of reverence in using a mathematical figure to serve as an analogy, or illustration, of the holy mystery of the person of our Lord, we can only say that all truth, whether in science or religion, is from God, and it is only natural that we should find semblances of

An illustration, imperfect as it may be, may be given of two concentric circles, two circles, the one in the other, and both having *one centre*. Suppose a centre of a boundless circle, so far as we can conceive of such a thing, at any rate a circle with a centre, whose circumference is beyond finite conception, to represent the divine person of the Logos. He has a personality, a centre of a boundless person, or being. Now let a finite circumference be drawn around the same centre, and you have two circles with but one centre. The one is limited, and thus represents the humanity of our Lord; the other is boundless, and thus represents His divinity.

I know it will be said that the conception of a boundless circle is a contradiction, an absurdity, because a circle implies a centre and a circumference, whereas in the supposed case there is no circumference. But this is only a difficulty we meet with in every conception of the being of God. For our finite thinking we need only to say that the circumference is indefinite, for that, after all, is the only conception we can form of infinity. Yet this does not contradict the *idea* of infinity, because we have such an idea, even though we cannot form a *conception* which is adequate to the idea. This is only saying that man has an intuition of the infinite and absolute, whilst his understanding cannot form a conception adequate to the intuition. In other words, there is in the human *reason*, or intuition, an *idea* of God, as being an infinite and absolute being, whilst yet man cannot form an adequate conception of such a being in the logical *understanding* as distinguished from the reason.

But this is leading us into a digression. It is not our purpose to discuss the Kantian problem of the unknowableness of God. In other connections we might attempt to show that the view of Kant, of Sir William Hamilton and others of that agnostic school, is erroneous, though it contains a partial truth

His nature and being in all His works. After all we use it only to illustrate the abstract truth that there may be one centre for two surroundings, whether in the organic or inorganic creation, well knowing that any such illustration is far from adequate in any other respect.

which may perhaps be gathered by the careful reader from the distinction we have made between the human reason and the *idea* and the logical understanding and its *conception*. At present we assume that we have an idea of an infinite God who is a personal being and therefore has a centre which we call personality.

Now, having explained the figure employed in illustration, the question remains to be discussed whether and how the divine personality of our Lord can become, and act in the capacity of, a human personality, and yet remain divine. I know this question embraces the whole mystery as to whether, and how, the infinite can become finite, God become man. In other words, is it possible for the infinite God to enter into the limitations of finite man, so as to be real and true man, whilst He continues to be real and true God. But it seems to me the difficulties connected with the whole problem can be considered to best advantage by reducing them to this point: can the divine personality, or *ego*, be at the same time the personal centre of the full and complete humanity in Christ, and still remain divine? If it can, then the human will in Christ has found its personality, its centre, and that centre fills the place of a human personality—and therefore is practically human, and so, in a sense, though not in the sense of *Nestorius*, Christ has a human personality—

To discuss this question it is necessary to consider how the human personality is related to the divine personality.

We may quote here, as *apropos*, from an article in the *Independent* of May 12th, from the pen of Dr. E. H. Johnston, of Crozier Theological Seminary, though we cannot endorse some of his conclusions, especially the one which seems to consider it necessary to identify the two natures in Christ, somewhat after the old theory of the *Monophysites*. He says on the subject of the one personality of our Lord:

“But would Jesus be a real man, according to this physiological account of His origin? No, He would not, except for one thing; it is coming to be recognized that the divine spirit is of the same species or kind of being as a human soul. The distinction between God and the soul of man is in extent of powers, not in kind of nature; quantitative, not qualitative. /If this be a

true opinion, then Christ was a real man, though He had a divine Father. The union of the Word with the mother element in His soul rounded out on the one hand His humanity, on the other hand the personality of the Word Himself. So far as I know, orthodox trinitarians are prompt to concede that neither of the persons in the Godhead, some might except the Father, is by Himself a 'person' in the ordinary meaning of the term.

"This doctrine of specific identity, with numerical distinctness, between God and the human soul, would seem to be approximated in the teaching that God made man in His image; that is, unlike the beasts, a person. It is boldly put forward by Luke when he makes Adam hold the same relation to God that Seth held to Adam, and that Jesus was 'supposed' to hold to Joseph. Luke cannot mean that God begat Adam; but he must mean that Adam's nature was what it would have been were he what Luke called him, 'the son of God.' If evidence less purely verbal is required—evidence which goes to the core of the case—is it not found in the fact that Jesus was not the monstrous offspring of two species, not a hybrid? He was, at the same time, man and God; but He was not the less God for being the son of Mary, nor the less man for being the Son of God."

What he says of the divine spirit and the human soul I would say of the divine personality and the human personality; they differ, so to speak, quantitatively, not qualitatively. Human personality is a miniature of the divine personality, or as the Scripture expresses it, the image and likeness of the divine; for this image and likeness must be predicated of the wholeness of man, as contained in his personality, his *ego*.

Now where the quality is the same, the higher includes in itself the lower, and can therefore take the place, and act in the capacity, of the lower.

This implies that humanity was eternal ideally in the Logos. He was the archetype of man, and for this reason man was created in the image and likeness of God. When the Logos assumed humanity He really and truly *came to His own*.

If a king takes the place of a servant he needs not to change his essential being, for the servant is a man as well as the king. The higher here can take the place of the lower. He can become a servant really and truly, and act in all respects in the capacity of a servant, without necessarily laying aside his humanity, nor absolutely giving up even his kingship. This latter must indeed be held in abeyance, must be limited to the

character of the servant, whilst he may still retain a consciousness of his royal nature.

So we are told in the epistle to the Philippians, that our Lord, whilst not thinking it robbery to be equal with God, yet took upon him the form of a servant, and humbled himself, etc. His divine personality, taking the place of the human personality, acted now through His human nature as its organ, and therefore its power and capacity of necessity became limited to the unfolding organ through which it acted, and yet as His life unfolded He had a growing consciousness of His divine nature which had voluntarily humbled itself in taking the form of a servant. The organ conditioned the activity of the personality, and He would, by no act of violence, break up this relation. His human will was the organ, in its sphere, for His personality, and this found its limits and capabilities in the divine will, or the law of God. As Logos His will was the divine will, which was at the same time the will of the Father and the Holy Spirit, for there is but one will in the Godhead; but now as human His will conformed itself to what was above it, and this by the activity and direction of His divine personality.

Must He not then have had two consciousnesses, one as man and one as God, and would not this be a dualism like that of the view of Nestorius? Of course we are confronted with a mystery here which we cannot fully fathom, but we may be aided in trying to comprehend it by an analogy. Every man, in the constitution of his person, has a sense of a twofold source of his being, or a twofold paternity, and yet his consciousness remains one. He has a sense of his human origin, or parentage, and at the same time he feels that his origin is in God, and that God is his father. As his consciousness unfolds, this God-consciousness unfolds, and moulds his self-consciousness. Consciousness in man is, we may say, threefold, self-consciousness, world-consciousness, and God-consciousness. The consciousness of the *ego* and the *non-ego*, of the *me* and the *not-me*, condition each other. God-consciousness unites these two, giving a sense of the union of self and the not-self, or the world, in one common

origin. Now what we mean to illustrate by this is, that there may be a twofold consciousness, of our human origin and our divine origin, and yet no disturbance of the unity of our being, our personality. This simply means that God can enter into every human being without disturbing the human personality, or human consciousness. And this adumbrates the mystery of the incarnation. The difference is that in the person of Christ the union is *hypostatic*, an *essential* union of God and man; whereas in the case of man in general the union is one of the divine influence operating upon the human soul—a moral union. In the case of a Christian it is called the *mystical* union in distinction from a *hypostatic* union. Man is then united to God, and becomes a partaker of the divine nature, as it is stated in one of the epistles of St. Peter, but this union is mediated by the life of Christ. A Christian becomes a partaker of the glorified humanity of Christ, which is signified by eating His flesh and drinking His blood, without which, our Saviour declares, no one can have eternal life.

Christ Himself uses this analogy to show to the Jews that a union of man with God was not something unnatural, or contrary to the original constitution of man. The Jews accused Him of blasphemy because, being a man, He made Himself God. "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods?" If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" (John 10: 34–36.) Christ does not mean here to reduce the mystery to a lower plane, does not mean to imply that the union of the divine and human in Him may be merely a moral union, such as was predicated of those in the Old Testament to whom the word of God came; but He holds up their case to show the original affinity of the human for union with the divine. Such moral union foreshadowed and prophesied the greater mystery of the incarnation, and He refers to that union in order to assist their faith to grasp the still greater mysterious

union in His own person. If there is such an affinity on the part of man for union with God, does not that very fact point to the complete and essential union of the divine and human in the God-man? *

Now our argument, in referring to this analogy, is that if in such moral union the divine may be present in the human soul, guiding and directing it, without disturbing the human consciousness, the same may be true where this union reaches its highest consummation in the person of Christ. He is conscious that He is the Son of God and the Son of Man, and yet He is one being, the God-man.

Just here we may find the key to unlock the mystery of the person of our Lord in such way as to escape the Gnostic heresy. That heresy denied the essential reality of His humanity, made it to be a mere appearance, an illusion. Now if the personality of Christ is purely divine, in such sense as to provide no human personality, then the tendency is to make His humanity something unreal. With His purely divine consciousness, He *appeared* to share in all the attributes, the weaknesses and imperfections of humanity, but this was not real. Whilst He *seemed* to increase in knowledge, yet He was in conscious exercise of omniscience. In other words, His divinity stood above and apart from His humanity, and had no part nor share in the development of His humanity. It was not the

* We read recently somewhere a sermon by Dr. Lyman Abbott on this passage, in which he takes the view that our Lord's argument here favors such lowering of the character of the union of the divine and human in Christ to the plane of a mere moral union, the same in kind as may have place in any man who is a recipient of divine grace. Christ possessed this divine grace (or life he might call it) in its fullness, but not in the sense of a hypostatic union. We need not say that this is not our view; but it is simply the view put forth by Strauss, according to which every man is a God-man; though singularly Strauss employed it to prove that Christ is not divine in any other sense than other men are divine. We incline to think that Dr. Abbott must reach substantially the same conclusion. We regard the argument of the Lord in that passage as a help to enable His hearers to rise from this moral union of man with God to the higher mystery of the unique union in His own person, the mystery of the Word made flesh.

divine Christ, but only the human who increased in wisdom and in favor with God and man; it was merely the human and not divine Christ that suffered and died upon the cross for man's redemption. Thus there is introduced a Nestorian dualism.

But now grant that the one personality was human as well as divine, or that the divine personality acted really and truly in the capacity of the human personality, then we can see how everything that Christ did can be predicated of His personality. It was not His divine nature that suffered on the cross, but neither was it His human nature, as such, apart from His divine nature; but it was the person who suffered through His humanity as its organ. The whole person of Christ suffered, yet not through the divine, but through the human nature.

When a man suffers pain, it is the *ego* that suffers; but the body is the organ through which the *ego* suffers. It is not the body, as such, apart from the soul, that suffers, but the person suffers. So the person of Christ suffered through His humanity. Taking this view, we can accord a measure of truth to the old theological view that the divinity of Christ did not suffer, whilst we can assert at the same time that the Christ, and the whole Christ, suffered.

The Apostle Peter said that he also was an elder, the greater including the less, and so, though of course in a deeper sense, Christ could be man in the inmost constitution of His personality. This view does not remove all difficulty in endeavoring to conceive of the person of Christ; but it locates the difficulty where it affords least hindrance to a proper apprehension of the mystery. If the personality of the Logos could fill the place of a human personality in Christ, without interfering with the unity of His being as one Christ, then we can see the full humanity of Christ in union with His divinity.

But this view (and every other view, it may be added, that accords with the Chalcedon Creed) implies that the personality of the Logos limited itself to the capacities and possibilities of the human nature which He had joined with the divine nature. His personality, His consciousness, unfolded itself gradually.

He was limited in power and in knowledge. Even in his moral nature He made progress; for it is said that "He learned obedience by the things He suffered."

Here we reach the problem of the *Kenosis*, which was discussed by the Lutheran divines already in the sixteenth century. The word *kenosis*, as is known to theologians, is taken from the passage, already referred to, Phil. 2: 6, et seq., which Thayer, in his New Testament Lexicon, translates as follows: "*Who, although (formerly when he was λόγος ἄσαρκος) he bore the form (in which he appeared to the inhabitants of heaven) of God (the sovereign, opposed to μορφ. δούλου), yet did not think that this equality with God was to be eagerly clung to or retained (see ἀρπαγμός, 2), but emptied himself of it (see κενόω, 1), so as to assume the form of a servant, in that he became like unto men (for angels are also δούλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rev. 19: 10; 22: 8 sq.), and was found in fashion as a man.*"

The verb ἐκένωσέν is here translated: "He emptied himself of it" (the form of God, μορφή Θεοῦ); and the question is, What is meant by emptying Himself of the form of God? Did the Logos lay aside or limit the attributes of His divinity when He became man, or were they in full exercise along with the attributes or capacities of His humanity? We do not propose to consider this question, except as it is involved in what is said of the Lord's personality. His personality may be called *theanthropic*, yet not in the sense of a *tertium quid*, formed by a mixture of a divine and a human *ego*, or personality, but in the sense that the divine, whilst it remains divine, nevertheless fills the place at the same time of the human personality.

Now let us apply this conclusion to the unfolding life of Jesus. From His birth on, He had a consciousness of the development of His being according to all the limitations of sinless human nature, and even that sinlessness was made a product of His own will, and not something imposed from a foreign source; for He said to His disciples: "For this cause I sanctify myself," etc.; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, already

quoted: "He learned obedience by the things he suffered." He really and truly, and not merely in appearance, passed through all the stages of human life, infancy, childhood, youth and manhood. He was ignorant, like all other children, and had to acquire an education. He had a moral and spiritual development, so that when He came to years of knowledge, He made His own the consecration which His parents made for Him in infancy. He was really and truly tempted in the wilderness, and He gained the victory by the determination of His will. In all His official life He subjected His human will to the divine will. He was divine also; but His divinity never interfered with the free activity and development of His human nature, never coerced His human will. We may here revert to the analogy already given of the activity of God in all men. That activity acts upon conscience; but it never coerces man's will so as to destroy his freedom of choice.

Now, although the divine was in Christ in greater measure than in any other man, was in Him in all the fulness of the Godhead (for we are told that "in him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily"), yet it left the human free in its growth and development, in all its activities. Thus we find a truly human Christ, the Son of Man.

He was also divine, the Son of God. His complete, perfect humanity already proves that He was more than man. His divinity shone through His humanity in His teaching, in His miraculous works, in His triumph over death and the grave, and especially in His final glorification. After He arose from the dead, He said to His disciples: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth." He prayed: "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." This, indeed, was the mystery that He on all occasions pressed upon His hearers, viz., that although He stood before them as man, yet He was the Son of God, equal with the Father and the Holy Ghost. This was the mystery that challenged their faith, because it could not be apprehended by the mind merely, but required a spiritual sympathy with what is godlike; yea,

it required a yielding to the drawing of the Father. "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." And when Peter made the great confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," he said: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto you, but my Father which is in heaven."

God is spirit, and therefore to reveal Himself to man He took upon Himself the form of the highest intelligent creature He had made (at least one of the highest), whom He had made in His own image, *man*. To recognize God in this form required spiritual susceptibility, a susceptibility to apprehend infinite purity and truth and love in such outward form.

Man He had to be, in order to rehead the race as the last Adam, in order to make atonement for the sin of the world in the form of him who had sinned, in order to be the brother of all men, in short, in order to be the mediator between God and man.

Divine He had to be in order to be the final, absolute, revelation of God to man, in order to be the source of eternal life to mankind. "As the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."

His divinity, or deity, however, reaches us only through the human as its organ. Hence His humanity was not merely a temporary form, which He might wear for a time, for the single purpose of making atonement for man in His death upon the cross; but it continues forever in heaven as the organ through which eternal life is communicated to man. Hence also believers must become partakers of His glorified humanity. "Except any one eat my flesh and drink my blood he hath no life in him." "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. The mystery of eating His flesh and drinking His blood here referred to, is not, indeed, limited to partaking of the Lord's Supper, but includes the whole mystery of receiving into the soul His glorified humanity in the new birth, but it does also include the transaction in that holy Supper, for all those who are self-conscious believers.

Hence the deep interest always taken in holding to the presence of the body and blood (humanity) of Christ in that Supper. Calvin lays especial stress upon the participation of the humanity of the Lord on the part of all believers, and hence he incorporated the idea of such participation in his doctrine of the Eucharist. It was not an unimportant, but a vital, matter about which the Reformers contended in their controversy on this holy sacrament.

But we are, perhaps, transcending the limits of our special subject in these remarks. Our object has been to show the practical importance of conceiving aright of the character of our Lord's person. It is not to be inferred that such understanding intellectually is necessary for all for salvation. Any one who believes that Jesus Christ is the Son of God may be saved. But to maintain this faith in the form of doctrine it is necessary to remove those obstacles out of the way that arise to disturb this faith, or becloud this doctrine. And one of these obstacles lies just here: How can I conceive of Christ as being both God and man in one person? Some believe in Him as man, as human only, and deny His divinity; while others believe in His divinity and set aside the reality of His humanity. But if He be real and true man, must He not have a human personality? This question we have tried to answer by advocating the view that His divine personality fills the place of the human, and thus there is in Him a human personality without dividing His one person.

This is not a merely speculative question, but intensely practical; for we believe this difficulty in regard to the human personality of Christ has stood much in the way of holding to His real humanity. If His personality is purely, only, divine, then it is difficult to conceive how He could act in every sense as truly man; but if we can hold that His divine personality acts in the place of the human, and thus becomes truly human whilst it remains divine, then we can see how He can act always as man.

The *Andover* theology has been for some time emphasizing this side of the mystery of Christ's person, His humanity. It

has been dwelling upon the *Incarnation* as lying at the basis of all that followed in the life of Christ. This, over against the view that the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin is the deepest, and the central, fact in the life of Christ. The death of Christ is central in redemption, but Christ came not only to redeem man, but to unite him in union with God. The incarnation is the central fact in regard to this union, and it is the deepest fact in revelation. Moreover Christ assumed human nature, not merely in order that He might have a human body for sacrifice, but His glorified humanity is the perpetual organ for conveying eternal life to His people. And in this view Christ is not only the means, or instrument, but He is also the source of salvation.

The *Andover Review* is now engaged in bringing out a series of articles on the divinity of Christ, in order, no doubt, to complement the articles on His humanity.

May it not be that the tendency to emphasize the divinity of Christ in such way as to overlook His true humanity, has been one occasion for the rise of the Unitarian belief? That belief seeks to find a true brotherhood in Christ, to bring Him near to every man in sympathy, and this perhaps was somewhat missing in the effort to emphasize the Saviour's divinity to the neglect of emphasizing His true humanity as well. The divinity of Christ is, indeed, central in the Christian faith, but along with this there is a yearning in all human hearts for a Saviour who is truly human, flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone. We desire to find in Him also our perfect example, and this He cannot be if His humanity is not real. When it is said He was tempted in all respects as we yet without sin, we feel that this could not be unless He contended against evil with the same nature and will as our own, that the temptation was not an appearance merely, but real.

If we have succeeded in showing that our Saviour has virtually and substantially a human personality, though not in such sense as to interfere with the unity of His person, and thus aided in the conception of His real and true humanity, our object has been attained.

II.

ORIGINAL BUDDHISM.

BY PROF. E. V. GERHART, D.D., LL.D.

AMONG all nations there is no people more religious, more metaphysical, and I may add none more ethical, than the inhabitants of Hindustan. Composed of different nationalities, holding various religious beliefs, and differing in their conceptions of what is obligatory and what is not obligatory, yet an intense religiosity is the marked characteristic of the Hindu. True it is that this feature distinguishes all oriental peoples; but judging from the reports we get from travelers and missionaries, the number of whose reports and well digested representations is multiplying from year to year, Hindustan stands out prominently for its religious genius.

We may distinguish roughly between three great branches of belief: Hinduism, Brahmanism, Buddhism. Brahmanism and Hinduism are in reality not two systems; practically they are one. Hinduism is merely an expansion of Brahmanism, modified by contact with Buddhism.

Brahmanism is spiritual pantheism. As Monier-Williams represents Brahmanism, it is a belief in the universal diffusion of an impersonal spirit, as the only really existing essence, called Brahma, and in its manifesting itself in mind and in countless material forces and forms, including gods, demons, men, and animals, which, after fulfilling their course, must ultimately be reabsorbed into the one impersonal essence and be again evolved in endless evolution and dissolution. There is no definite perception of personality either of man or of God. The law of human life and the law of the lower kingdoms of nature are identical. The process of reproduction going on in the

regeneration Buddhism is the process of regeneration going on in the human kingdom.

"Buddhism" says the author who has just been quoted, "with its varying of Karma and Nirva is based on the pantheistic doctrine that the majority of the Hindus are merely observers of Brahmanical institutions with their accompanying Hindu superstitions."

Buddhism is directly the opposite of Brahmanism, especially the system as taught by Gautama and originally held by his followers. In Brahmanism it is the idea of the Divine that is dominant. In Buddhism the dominant principle is the Human.

But before I attempt to represent the leading features of original Buddhism it is important to emphasize one reigning idea common to oriental religions. That idea, as it is commonly called, is the transmigration of souls. No belief is more deep-seated and firmly rooted in the oriental mind.

* Of all the authors I have read in Gautama and his system of pessimistic philosophy, I have found Monier-Williams to be most thorough, learned and satisfactory. His work entitled: "Buddhism in its Connexion with Brahmanism and Hinduism and in its Contrast with Christianity," is based, not on the result of investigations made by other scholars, but on his own original, patient researches made in Hindustan by studying the literature of Buddhism in the Pali language and by traveling through the land where the system was first taught by Gautama. Of his book and of himself he says in the Preface:

"I have aimed at effecting what no other English Orientalist has, to my knowledge, ever accomplished. I have endeavored to deal with a complex subject as a whole, and to present in one volume a comprehensive survey of the entire range of Buddhism from its earliest origin in India to its latest modern developments in other Asiatic countries.

"I have brought to the study of Buddhism and its sacred language Pali, a life-long preparatory study of Brahmanism and its sacred language Sanskrit.

"I have on three occasions traveled through the sacred land of Buddhism, and have carried on my investigations personally in the land of its origin, as well as in Ceylon and on the borders of Tibet."

His representation goes to the root of the system, which is a philosophy rather than a religion, and is throughout self-consistent, a system which in many of its precepts resembles the precepts of Christ, but as to its principle and substance is at war with the genius of the Christian Religion.

To Monier-Williams more than to all other authors I am indebted for the contents of this article.

As in the kingdoms of nature there is a process of transformation going on in constant succession from age to age, so, it is held, the same process is going on in the human race. In the inorganic world there is integregation, accretion, formation according to natural law, followed by disintegration and dissolution. In the organic world we have the seed growing into the plant, the plant producing the bud, the flower, the fruit containing the seed after its kind, followed by decay and death. Then from the new seed the same process of development is begun which runs through the same cycle of changes. So is man. A child is the present form of the existence of a soul which for ages has been passing through innumerable transformations of plants, of lower or higher grade, of animals, of fishes or birds, of horses or lions, of tigers or elephants, or of demons or gods, until at length the soul appears on the plane of human life. Here it moves through the same cycle of growth and maturity, of decline and death. But human death is not extinction.

Death immediately transfers the soul into the form of some lower or higher animal, into a demon or a god, thrusting him lower down or raising him higher up. If the soul has in this life accumulated a large amount of merits, death may transform its embodiment at once into a well-fed and richly-caparisoned horse, instead of a beast of burden. If in this life the soul fails to accumulate merits it will at death reappear in a serpent, a lizard, a toad or a bug. This process is interminable. Whether at death the human soul becomes a noble steed or a venomous serpent, in either case, that is only a fresh beginning of a continued series of painful transformations. Even if the soul is transformed into a god, that elevation may not be permanent. Hindu belief accepts the possibility, even the probability, of the transformation of a god into a lower order of existence. Then the same process of birth and death, of death and birth, is resumed, and it may go on age after age through all the realms of the universe.

Constant and interminable transformation of the world is the ruling idea of Hindu philosophy. The universe of things good

and bad, high and low, is a circular motion, ever recurring, ever repeating itself, through all the ages, without an assignable reason, without known purpose, producing pain, suffering, sorrow. The lines of Shelly are quoted by Monier-Williams as fitly picturing this Hindu philosophy :

Worlds on Worlds are rolling ever,
From creation to decay ;
Like the bubbles on a river,
Sparkling, bursting, borne away.

Buddhism, at first glance the opposite of Brahmanism, is nevertheless in truth only a modification of it. Both are at bottom a species of pessimistic pantheism. A brief history of Buddha may serve as a representation of the leading features of his system.

The best authorities reject the notion that the Buddha is a myth. The evidences, in the opinion of the most learned orientalists, are adequate to justify the belief that his person and life are historical.

The Buddha was born about the year 500 B. C. His individual name was *Gautama*, in the Pali language *Gotama*. His father was Suddhodana, a large land-owner of the tribe of the Sākya, whose territory extended from the lower Nepalese mountains to the river Rapti in the province of Oudh. Gautama was known by his individual name up to the time of his supposed attainment of perfect wisdom, when he assumed the title of Buddha, meaning "the enlightened one," the one who has true knowledge and pursues the right course of life.

In accord with the doctrine of transmigration the birth of the Gautama Buddha was a rebirth. He existed previously in the Tushita heaven. When the full time came to be born on earth, as the legend relates, he became the child of his mother, whose name was Maya, descending in the form of a white elephant. As he grew up no efforts were made to imbue him with sacred learning. His love of contemplation developed itself very early, and he was allowed to pass most of his time in the open air.

According to the universal custom throughout India Gautama

was made to marry at the age of sixteen or seventeen, and he had probably at least one son whose name was Rāhula.

At the age of twenty-nine the sense of the vanity of all human aims grew upon him, and he was forming the resolution to abandon all worldly ties and enter upon a monastic life. The final resolve he was led to make in consequence of four visions. One day riding in his chariot there appeared before his eyes the form of a decrepit old man, his skin shrivelled, his head bald, his teeth gone, his body infirm and bent.

Soon another strange sight came before him: A sick man, worn by disease and suffering, pale and miserable, tottering on the road. The third vision was a corpse, borne on a bier.

Next day appeared a man with a shaven crown and a monk's robe, his right shoulder bare, a religious staff in his right hand, and a mendicant's alms-bowl in his left. Gautama asked the man to give an account of his condition. The man answered: "I am called a homeless ascetic; I have forsaken the world, relatives and friends; I seek deliverance from myself, and desire the salvation of all creatures, and I do harm to none."

After hearing these words, Gautama went to his father and said: "I wish to become a wandering ascetic, and to seek Nirvāṇa; all worldly things are changeable and transitory."

His resolution was taken, and firmly he stood by it. All efforts to restrain him were in vain. About this time, it is said, he receives intelligence of the birth of his son Rāhula. This is a crisis. He sees in his child the strongest of all fetters, binding him to family and home. The beautiful women of his father's household strive to divert him from his purpose, but in vain. "He seeks the chamber of his wife, and finds her asleep with her hand on the head of his infant son. He longs for a last embrace; but fearing to arouse her suspicions hurries away. Outside, his favorite horse is waiting to aid his flight." His departure Buddhists call "the great going forth from home."

Then follow the temptations of Māra, the evil deity; but the tempter's allurements are all repelled. Gautama exclaims: "I would rather be torn to pieces limb by limb, or be burnt in a

fiery furnace, or be ground in pieces by a falling mountain than forego my fixed purpose for one single instant."

What was Gautama's fixed purpose? Not to enter into communion with God; not to fit himself to receive a revelation from God; not to teach men the way of eternal life. His purpose was directly the opposite: to extinguish all desires, all the instincts of the body, all the affections of the soul, and reduce himself if possible to non-existence. This purpose he could accomplish chiefly in two ways: by torturing his body, and by reflection on himself.

Putting on the garments of a beggar, he first becomes a disciple of the Brahmans; but Brahmanical philosophy does not afford him the peace for which his soul is craving.

As Brahmanic philosophy does not afford relief, he resorts to another way of emancipation taught by the Brahmans, the way called Tapas, the severest bodily mortification, consisting in fasting and self-inflicted tortures.

In company with five other ascetics, Gautama begins his celebrated fast of six years, "Sitting down with his legs folded under him, on a raised seat in a place unsheltered from sun, wind, rain, dew and cold, he gradually reduced his daily allowance of food to a single grain of rice. Then holding his breath, he harassed and macerated his body. But all in vain. No peace of mind came."

Then convinced of his folly, and arousing himself, he took food in a natural way. When refreshed he moved away to another spot; there under the shelter of a fig-tree, he gave himself up to intense and prolonged meditation upon himself. The method of meditation (Dhyana) in vogue among the Brahmans is prescribed by the laws of Manu, who lived not earlier than the second century B. C., and possibly as late as the second century of the Christian era. Manu says: Let the devotee "purge himself from all taints by suppression of breath, from sin by restraints of thought, from sensual attachments by control, and from unspiritual qualities by meditation." In another work the Brahmanic rule gives this direction: "Holding his

body, head, and neck quite immovable, seated on a firm seat in a pure spot with grass around, the devotee should look only at the tip of his nose, and should meditate on the Supreme Being." He is directed to meditate so profoundly as to think about nothing whatever.*

Engaging in meditation according to these rules, Gautama was again assailed by the temptations of Mara, the evil spirit. This time the assault was more terrific than before. Mara, the destroyer, seized the opportunity when from protracted self-mortification Gautama had but little power of resistance. The evil spirit said: Why not return to the world? Why not indulge in pleasures? Why not go back to home, wife, and child?

But Gautama withstood the attack. "After rising to higher and higher stages of abstract meditation at the end of a long night, he shook off his foe. The victory was won, and the light of true knowledge broke upon his mind. A legend relates that in the first night-watch he gained a knowledge of all his previous existences; in the second, a knowledge of all present states of being; in the third night-watch, a knowledge of the chain of causes and effects; and at the dawn of day Gautama knew all things."

The dawn of the day on which this struggle ended was the birthday of Buddhism. Gautama was about thirty-five years of age, when he gained a right to the title of Buddha, the Enlightened. The tree under which he sat became celebrated as the tree of knowledge and enlightenment. It is called the Bodhi

* Dhyana or intense abstract meditation is the chief religious exercise, and is divided into four stages: The *first* stage consists in fixing the mind on some object, in such a way that a state of ecstatic joy and serenity is attained. The *second* consists in concentrating the soul so intensely on itself that the thinking faculties cease to act. In the *third* nothing remains but serenity. The *fourth* is a trance-like condition of utter indifference and torpor, in which there is neither any exercise of thought, nor any conscious joy or serenity, but the whole being is released from the fetters of sense, and soars to a transcendental condition characterized by a latent energy and a power of working miracles.--*Buddhism*, by Monier-Williams, p. 209.

tree, or in familiar language Bo-tree, and is the most sacred symbol among Buddhists; just as the night on which Gautama obtained perfect enlightenment is the most sacred night.

The first words said to have been spoken by Gautama as the utterance of his perfect enlightenment were to this effect: "Through countless births have I wandered, seeking but not discovering the Maker of this my mortal dwelling-house, and still again and again have birth and life and pain returned. But now at length art Thou discovered, Thou Builder of this house of flesh. No longer shalt thou rear a house for me. Rafters and beams are shattered with destruction of Desire, deliverance from repeated life is gained at last."

After obtaining this complete enlightenment Buddha sat cross-legged on the ground under the Bo-tree for seven days absorbed in meditation, when he thought out the law of causation.

Next he meditated for another seven days under a Banyan tree. Then he meditated under another tree for a third period of seven days. A fourth period of meditation was passed under another tree, making four times seven days. During this long period of meditation he fasted. Then he arose and went forth to preach his doctrine from place to place, gathering his followers into companies of monks. Continuing this work of itineration for forty-five years, he died, it is said, at the age of eighty.*

Now let us inquire: What did this enlightenment consist in? The answer is this: By intense thought Gautama came to see that *all existence is evil*, the life of man is only pain and suffering; and this suffering runs on endlessly in an inexorable succession of births and rebirths. What is the cause of this suffering? The answer is *existence*, individual and personal existence. To get rid of personal existence is to get rid of suffering. That is the only alternative. If there be no individual, no embodied soul, there can be no suffering.

* A tradition says that the immediate cause of his death was an immoderate meal of pork.

But how shall a man get rid of existence? The answer is by annulling the cause. Then he inquires what is the cause of individual existence? The answer is *birth*. If there be absolutely no birth, no rebirth of the individual soul, there can be no existence. Then the problem is how to destroy the possibility of birth and rebirth. In the effort to solve this problem we get the philosophy of Buddhism. On this philosophy at bottom rests the entire Buddhistic system. This wisdom he gained absolutely from himself. The Buddha never claimed to be the channel of supernatural revelation. "He always maintained the only revelation he had received was an illumination from within, due entirely to his own intuitions, assisted by his reasoning powers and by severe purgatorial discipline protracted through countless previous births in every variety of bodily form."

Buddha lays down the universal principle that to break the link in the chain of countless transmigrations it is necessary to root out all desires, kill all affections, break all bonds that connect the individual with persons whoever they may be, whether mother, wife or child, and with things whatever they may be.* One step further the system proceeds: it maintains that in order to extinguish desire a person must resolve himself into inaction; and inaction involves on the one hand total separation from all objects external to the individual, and on the other hand an absolute introversion of thought; his mind must be turned in upon himself, and he must think upon himself so intensely from hour to hour, from day to day, from week to week, that in process of time he meditates so profoundly as to think about nothing whatever. Thought itself ceases.

Gautama proceeds on the Brahmanical principle that action has a self-perpetuating force. Every man's destiny is *entirely* dependent on his own acts. Even against his will he is forced

* He taught that if a monk should happen to see his mother in danger of drowning, he should not attempt to save her. The act might strengthen interest in and affection for his mother, and so strengthen the bond of connection as to increase the possibility of continuous individual existence by rebirths.

on from one body to another body by his former works. "As from a lump of clay a workman makes what he pleases, even so a man obtains whatever destiny he has wrought out for himself." Destiny means another form of existence in some animal, or in a god, or in a demon, but a form, whatever it may be, that continues only for an age or a term of years, and is to be followed by another higher or lower form according to the degree of merit or demerit which he may possess.

The only creator recognized by true Buddhists is Act-force. It is said: "My action is the womb that bears me." "It is Act-force that creates worlds. It is Act-force, in conjunction with Upādāna, that is, 'clinging to existence,' that creates all beings in any of the six classes into which they are divided: namely, gods, men, demons, animals, ghosts and the dwellers in hell. It is the Act-force which, according to Buddhism, resists death."

Buddha claims that he has discovered the secret of annulling this Act-force; and thus he overcomes and extinguishes the possibility of the otherwise inevitable and interminable transmigration of the soul by rebirths. To be rescued from this Act-force, and thereby to extinguish the possibility of repeated individual existence is salvation. Salvation is deliverance from the everlasting miseries of the endless transmigration of souls, and the only possible deliverance consists in the extinction of individual existence. Says Monier-Williams: The doctrine is that 'existence of all kinds involves suffering, and that such suffering can only be got rid of by self-restraint and the extinction of desires, especially the desire for the continuity of personal existence. Whatever may be said of the Christian-like self-renunciation enjoined by the Buddhist code of morality, it remains that the only self Buddhism aims at renouncing is the self of personality, and the chief self-love Buddhism deprecates is the self-love which consists in craving for continuous individual life.'

According to this broad general doctrine the Buddha propounds *four Noble Truths*: 1. All existence, in any form,

whether on earth or in heavenly spheres, necessarily involves pain and suffering. 2. All suffering is caused by lust or craving or desire, which is of three kinds: desire for sensual pleasure, for wealth, and for existence. 3. Cessation of suffering is simultaneous with extinction of lust, craving and desire. 4. Extinction of desire and cessation of suffering is accomplished by perseverance in the noble eight-fold path.

The noble eight-fold path consists (1) in right belief, which means believing in the Buddha and in his doctrine; (2) in the right resolve, which means abandoning one's wife and family; (3) in right speech, which is the recitation of the Buddha's doctrine; (4) in right work, which is the work of a monk; (5) in a right livelihood, which is living by alms as a monk does; (6) in right exercise, which is suppression of the individual self; (7) in right mindfulness, which is keeping in mind the impurities and impermanence of the body; and (8) in right mental concentration, which is trance-like quietude. By these methods the Buddhist may attain to Nirvana, the absolute extinction of all desires.

Buddha's view of life as mere suffering may be seen from a sermon addressed to his monks. The following is an extract: "Birth is suffering. Decay is suffering. Illness is suffering. Association with objects we hate is suffering. Separation from objects we love is suffering. Not to obtain what we desire is suffering. Clinging to the five elements of existence is suffering. These five elements are, the organized body; sensation of the eye, ear, nose, tongue, skin, and mind; perception of ideas; the aggregate of mental tendencies, forming individual character, derived from previous existences; and consciousness or thought. Complete cessation of thirst and of desires is cessation of suffering. This is the noble truth of suffering."

All kinds of suffering the Buddha referred to *one* cause. That cause is *ignorance*; and ignorance is the want of knowledge of the four Noble Truths which I have just quoted. Ignorance of these truths precedes lust, the primary cause of the miseries of human life.

From the representation I have given of the leading features of Buddhism, as originally taught by the Buddha, we

may infer its practical effect on social life. The paramount aim of the system "was to convince others that to get rid of ignorance, to gain knowledge, and obtain deliverance from unending rebirths, it was incumbent on a wise man to renounce married life and become a member of a monastic order." Pure Buddhism was pure monachism, including celibacy, poverty, and mendicancy. To maintain a monastic order it was necessary to enact certain rules for discipline and outward conduct. To these let us give a little attention.

The rules adopted by the Buddha were a modification of the rules for two religious orders in Brahmanism, and covered the entire personal life of the monks. For example, the *resources* of the monks were four: 1. Broken morsels given in alms for food; 2. Rags from a dust heap for clothes; 3. Roots of trees for an abode; 4. Liquid putrefying excreta of cows for medicine. In practice, however, indulgences in all four cases were allowed.

The chief *prohibitions* were also four: 1. Unchastity; 2. Taking anything not given, even a blade of grass; 3. Killing any living thing, even an ant, or worm, or plant; 4. Falsely claiming the extraordinary powers of a perfect saint.

The following practices were also incumbent on all monks:

1. "The wearing vestments given by laymen (not purchased) and consisting of three lengths of yellow-colored rags; or, if entire lengths of cotton cloth were given, the saleable value had to be destroyed by tearing them into at least three pieces, and then sewing them together:

2. "The owning no possessions except three cloths, a girdle, a bowl, razor, needle, and water-strainer to prevent the swallowing of animalculæ:

3. "The living only on food collected in a wooden bowl by daily going from house to house, but without ever asking for it:

4. "The eating at mid-day the one meal so collected and at no other time:

5. "The fasting on four prescribed days:

6. "The abiding in one spot for three or four months during Vassa, 'the rains' (from middle of June to middle of October),

men itineration would involve trampling on vegetable and insect life :

7. "The refraining from a recumbent posture under all circumstances :

8. "The visiting cremation-grounds for meditation on the corruption of the body."

The Buddhist monk submitted to the most stringent regulations in waking and sleeping, in dressing and undressing, in standing and sitting, in going out and coming in, in fasting and eating, in speaking and not speaking.

Let us remember that the genuine Buddhist was a monk who lived strictly according to the rules of the order. Monachism was the very pith and marrow of Buddhism.

According to the Buddha women had a very hard time of it. There was no salvation for a woman. At first all women were excluded from his order ; but in time he yielded to the justice of the plea for women's rights. He allowed women to become nuns, and put them under the direction of monks. But the only hope of a woman was that by rigidly observing the obligations of a nun she would store up enough merit to become worthy of being reborn and transformed into the individuality of a man ; then by strictly observing the rules of a monk she might have the hope of Nirvana.

Nirvana and Pari-Nirvana are to be distinguished. Nirvana was attainable during natural life. It consists in the extinction of all craving, all desire, especially the desire for continuity of existence. The Buddha by inaction, by intense and long-continued meditation and by the rigid observance of the rules prescribed for the monks attained to this state. But previously he had passed through 550 births, all of which came to his knowledge by meditation. The noteworthy point about the repeated births of Gautama Buddha, as Monier-Williams remarks, is that there appears to have been no rise from lower to higher forms ; but a mere jumble of metamorphoses. We find him born four times as Mahā-brahma, twenty times as Indra, once as a hare, eighty-three times as an ascetic, fifty-eight

times as a king, twenty-four times as a Brahman, once as a gamester, eighteen times as a monkey, six times as an elephant, eleven times as a deer, once as a dog, four times as a serpent, six times as a snipe, once as a frog, twice as a fish, four times as a tree god, *twice* as a pig, ten times as a lion, four times as a cock, twice as a thief, *once* as a devil-dancer, and so on. In these previous forms of existence he did many worthy deeds. For example : Gautama gives an account of his birth as a hare. He says he was a hare living in a forest. He ate grass and did no one any harm. The thought came to him : Suppose a worthy object of charity passes by, what can I give him ? I live on grass only ; I cannot offer a starving man grass ; I must give him myself. Then a Brahman came by. Gautama, the hare, said to him : Collect wood, place it in a heap and kindle a fire. The Brahman did so. The hare leaped into the midst of the blazing fire, and was roasted ; then the Brahman ate the roasted hare. On another occasion he cut his own body to pieces to redeem a dove from a hawk. By such acts of self-sacrifice in previous forms of existence he acquired enough merit to be reborn finally as Gautama. Then as Gautama Buddha he became worthy of Nirvana—that is the total cessation of the desire for existence. Gautama had been preceded by twenty-four Buddhas, who were to previous ages of the world what he was to the present.

At his death Gautama attained to the blessedness of Pari-Nirvana. What is that ? It is none other than the total cessation of *individual existence*. The utter cessation of desire for existence issues finally in extinction. All thought, all power of thought ceases. It ceases absolutely. There is no longer the possibility of another birth. The process of transformation from age to age is abolished. This is the blessedness of Pari-Nirvana.

The Nirvana of Brahmanism and the Pari-Nirvana of Buddhism differ. In Brahmanism the devotee by ascetic practices gains enough merit to be worthy at death of losing his individuality ; he loses it by absorption into deity ; deity being the

universal Essence. But absorption into deity does not necessarily end the miseries of existence. Emanations are unceasingly going forth from deity; new souls, new formations are ever re-appearing. The individual man absorbed into deity may in the process of the ages be again individualized; and then he will again pass through an endless succession of births and re-births.

The Pari-Nirvana of Buddhism annihilates the possibility of a re-birth. The cessation of individual existence is not absorption of the individual into Brahm or deity, but it is the extinction of the individual. The possibility of transformation ceases because there is no longer any thing or subject to be born or re-born. The blessedness of Pari-Nirvana is the blessing of annihilation, or the utter exhaustion and the ceasing to be of any positive individual living thing.

The aim of this paper has been only to present some prominent features of original Buddhism. In order not to go beyond its intended length, a number of salient points have to be omitted, especially the difference between original Buddhism as taught by Gautama and modern Buddhism, also the difference between theoretic Buddhism and practical Buddhism. In process of time there has been a recoil. The innate instinct of worship has asserted itself in manifold forms of idolatry. Innumerable images of the Buddha are the objects of devotion wherever Buddhism is now the reigning belief. What was originally a system of pessimistic philosophy, has in spite of all its contrary hypotheses, become a religion, or a mongrel system of philosophy and religion.

I shall close by stating a few of the points of resemblance and of the many points of difference between Buddhism and Christianity.

There is a remarkable resemblance between Buddhism and Christianity as to some of its ethical precepts.

Buddhism says: do not love the world, do not love money, hate not your enemies, do no unrighteous acts, commit no impurities, overcome evil with good, and do to others as you desire them to do to you. But the end of such precepts is not to develop and mature an ideal personal life, but to detach the

Buddhist from all objects, and so break the power of the law of individual being. Of the one the aim is the blessedness of conscious and free existence of man in a state of perfection ; of the other the aim is to render the conscious existence of the individual man after death an impossibility. For a fundamental maxim of Buddhism is, that human life is not worth living, neither on earth, nor in hell, nor in heaven.

There is a remarkable resemblance, also, between Buddhist asceticism and the ascetic practices of the Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic Churches. But the resemblance of penances, of self-imposed bodily mortifications, is only outward. As to the principle, spirit, and ultimate aim the difference is world-wide.

The one thing in which Buddhism is perhaps most really akin to Christianity is its universality. Buddhism sets aside all the distinctions of caste. All classes of the lowest no less than the highest people were admitted to the Order of Gautama by which true enlightenment may be obtained. Even animals were not excluded.

A story is told of five hundred bats that lived in a cave where two monks daily recited the law. These bats gained such merit by simply hearing the sound that when they died they were all re-born as men and ultimately as gods. Then they were on a fair way of at length reaching Pari-Nirvana. Woman seems to have had more difficulty in being admitted to the blessings of Buddhism than the bats.

Some of the striking points of difference are the following :

Christianity believes in one Supreme Being, the one personal God, from whom proceedeth all the temporal and spiritual good. Buddhism knows no personal God who is supreme. It has gods as well as demons ; but a Buddhist monk, an Arhat, may have more merit than a Buddhist god. Gods and demons are only higher and lower forms in the everlasting process of transformation. Gautama Buddha was above the gods.

Christianity reveals the truth that the one personal God is the Creator and Former of the universe. The world has come into existence by virtue of His originative will. Buddhism

honors mighty deities, but they are not held to be the creators of the world in the Christian sense. They are merely Supreme Rulers outside and above it; for Northern Buddhists agree with Southern that the world exists of itself, and its only Creator is the force of its own acts.

Christianity is the self-manifestation of God in Jesus Christ. It claims to be the Truth by which all men may attain to godlike wisdom and godlike righteousness. Buddha believes in no God who is supreme over all things, who is the only source of wisdom, and therefore he cannot recognize a revelation. He needs no revelation. Buddha turns to himself alone. The last words spoken by him to his monks before his death are these: "I am now grown old; I have reached eighty years; just as a worn-out cart can only with much care be made to move along, so my body can only be kept going with difficulty. In future be ye to yourselves your own light, your own refuge; seek no other refuge. Look not to any one but yourselves as a refuge. Behold now, O monks, I exhort you: everything that cometh into being passeth away. Work out your own perfection with diligence."

Christianity provides a personal Saviour; Jesus Christ makes atonement for sin; He delivers all who believe in Him from sin and death. Buddha does not profess to be a saviour. The only person he can save is himself. All he professes to do consists in imparting to men the knowledge of the method by which every man may save himself; and that salvation is, not eternal life, not deliverance from sin, but emancipation from the miseries of life by the cessation of personal existence.

Christianity is the firm foundation of the hope that all the members of Christ will overcome death and attain to the blessedness of eternal life; that eternal life is the positive perfection of personality in the communion of unchanging love with the personal God in the realm of His own glory. Buddhism also teaches a heaven, a lower and a higher heaven. But the Buddhist heaven is deliverance from the ever on-going wheel of transmigration. And the perfection of that deliverance is none

other than self-annihilation. The life of man, like a candle, is blown out; and the consequence is the blessing of nothingness.

I shall name but one more of many remarkable differences. Buddhism, like all pagan philosophy and nearly all ethnic religions, sets its iron heel on the neck of woman. Woman as woman is hopeless. There is nothing before her but the transmigration of her soul from age to age. The only chance she has is the possible transformation into a man. Christianity, on the contrary, recognizes woman as a personal being. From Genesis to Revelation the Word of God puts her personality on a level with the personality of man. Like man she is formed in God's image. Like man she shares the new birth of the Holy Spirit of Christ and the forgiveness of sins from God. Christianity is the religion that honors my mother, my sister, my wife, my daughter as my equal.

The contrast between Buddhism and Christianity is a vast, profound, yea an impassable gulf. When the two systems are thoroughly studied it becomes evident that there are no affinities whatever, between the religion of Christianity and the philosophy of Gautama.

Gautama was a man naturally of noble spirit. He had a deep sense of the vanity and misery of human life. He cherished lively sympathies with men; he spent forty-five years in the endeavor to save them from interminable sufferings. But to accomplish his purpose he set himself against man; he crushed every social relation; he went counter to all the nobler instincts of the soul; he turned away from God, and arrayed himself against himself. His system, notwithstanding its many noble sentiments, may justly be styled to be a system of physical, mental and moral suicide.

III.

SAMUEL GULDIN, PIETIST AND PIONEER.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, D.D.,

It is pleasant to put on record the following facts concerning the personal history of Samuel Guldin, one of the earliest ministers of the Reformed Church in the United States. Though his descendants have preserved a tradition that he was a Swiss minister who, in some unexplained way, had suffered persecution, the particulars of his eventful career appear to have been entirely forgotten. He is ignored by earlier writers, such as Mayer, Harbaugh and Heisler; and in the "Historic Manual"

*AUTHORITIES—*Guldin's Works*.—1. Kurtze Apologie oder Schutz-Schrift der unschuldig verdächtig-gemachten und verworffenen Pietisten zu Bern in Schweiz: in sich haltend.

1. Die wider sie gethane Relation der Commission vor einer hohen Obrkeit daselbst, so geschehen den 9 Junii, 1699.

2. Die Apologie oder Schutz-Schrift dagegen aufgesetzt und ans Licht gegeben von Samuel Guldin, gewesenen Prediger und Diacono in allen dreyen Haupt-Kirchen daselbst. Gedruckt in Philadelphia im Jahr Christi 1718.

II. Kurtze Lehr und Gegensätze zu Erläuterung und Rettung der Göttlichen Wahrheit, von Samuel Guldin. Philadelphia, 1718.

III. Samuel Guldin's, gewesenen Predigers in den Drey Haupt-Kirchen zu Bern in der Schweiz, Sein unpartheyisches zeugnüss über die neue Vereinigung aller Religions-Partheyen in Pennsylvania. Gedruckt bey Christoph Saur in Germantown, 1743.

Max Goebel's "Geschichte des Christlichen Lebens;" I. D. Rupp's "History of Berks and Lebanon Counties," etc.

The writer also expresses his obligations to Drs. E. Bloesch and Herman Escher, of Switzerland, for the examination of original records; and to the Hon. Samuel W. Pennypacker, LL.D., of Philadelphia; the Rev. Isaac S. Stahr, of Oley; and the Rev. James G. Dengler, of Sellersville, for information concerning the American history of Samuel Guldin and his descendants.

Guldin, D.D., of New York, preached in 1863 by Isaac Ferris, D.D., it is said that Dr. Guldin's "great grandfather came to this country over a hundred years ago from Berne, Switzerland, and settled in Pennsylvania, and his family have become numerous." Having enjoyed the acquaintance of the late Dr. Guldin, and of many others of the family, we venture to say that the above was all that they certainly knew concerning their distant ancestor.

The attention of the writer was first attracted to this by observing the statement, in Hildeburn's "Issue of the Pennsylvania Press," that Samuel Guldin published, a small volume concerning the union of all the churches in Pennsylvania, as proposed by Count Zinzendorf. Of this but a single copy is known to exist; and it is of considerable value by its owner, the Hon. S. W. Pennypacker, of Philadelphia. On the title-page its author is styled "late pastor of the three principal churches of Berne, in Switzerland." This, then, was a clue which deserved to be carefully followed. As Guldin had occupied so prominent a position, it was probable that he must have left traces in local history; and I accordingly addressed notes of inquiry to several gentlemen in Switzerland who were supposed to be most likely to furnish the desired information. As a result of this course

Berne, Switzerland. His father, Joachim Guldin, was a native of the canton of St. Gall, and had removed to Berne, in 1638. The son was well educated at Berne, and subsequently visited foreign universities. He himself tells us that he studied at Geneva and Lausanne, and afterwards, in company with several Swiss fellow-students, spent some time in Germany and Holland.

It was at Geneva that an event occurred which was to Guldin the beginning of a higher and better life. He himself described it when, at a later date, he was accused of having become a Pietist in Germany, in the following words: "If you insist on knowing the origin of our so-called *Pietism*, it is as follows: There were four of us who resolved to make a journey from Berne to Geneva. We determined above all things to make it a *Christian journey*, to avoid the quarrels which are common among students, and to gather heavenly treasure. At Geneva Mr. Lutz became ill, and during his illness he was not alone brought to a profound knowledge of his spiritual condition, but all of us, who before could not agree, became so united in spirit that we ever afterwards remained faithful to each other. And this happened in Geneva, in *sede Calvini*. Then we journeyed together to Lausanne, and thereafter met daily in the morning and evening for the worship of God."

With a certain grim humor Guldin excuses his German teachers from any attempt to influence him in favor of Pietism. He says, "They did not know anything about it." This is probable, for we know that German theology had become fossilized, and religious worship was official and mechanical in the last degree. As Spener said: "The old scholastic theology, which Luther had thrown out of the front door, had returned the back way and taken its ancient position."*

It is not, however, to be supposed that Guldin remained uninfluenced by the Pietism of Germany. It was the period of Spener's greatest activity, and from Strasburg to Dresden the whole community was moved. If the theologians knew nothing

* Max Goebel's "Geschichte," II, 569.

about Pietism, the people certainly felt its presence. They may not have known it by name, but the power of a new life was felt through all the land.

Ritschl maintains that though Spener is justly called "the father of Pietism," he was "himself not a Pietist;" and it is certain that few of the errors and none of the extravagances of the movement can be ascribed to him. Personally he might have been called, like Annoni of Basel, "the pastor after God's own heart." He had no quarrel with the orthodoxy of his time, but his intense earnestness, and the discipline which he enforced could not fail to produce results beyond the lines which he had originally laid down. Sectarians of all kinds felt encouraged to utter their protests against the established churches. Mystics propounded strange doctrines and prophesied the speedy consummation of all things. From all of these enthusiasts arose a cry: "Come ye forth out of Babel."

The position of the Pietists who adhered to the established churches was by no means enviable. They stood between two fires, and were likely to be singed by both. Though their sole purpose was to revive the ancient churches in accordance with the spirit of the gospel, they were charged with heresy, and often most unjustly persecuted and condemned. On the other hand, fanatics accused them of lacking courage to express their convictions. Repudiated by the orthodox zealots of the Church, they were, of course, in constant danger of falling into the extravagancies of the mystics.

While we do not doubt that Guldin was unconsciously influenced by what he heard and read in Germany, it is certain that his Pietism was of a very mild type, which in some places might have passed unchallenged. It was his misfortune to be brought into collision with a government which, in its pride of orthodoxy, was narrow-minded, bigoted and merciless.

Guldin appears to have returned to Switzerland in 1691,—the very year in which the Pietists of Germany founded the University of Halle. In August, 1692, he became pastor of the church at Stettlen, a village a league from Berne. He was

no doubt married when he entered upon his charge, and on the 8th of November, 1693, his eldest son, Samuel, was born. As a preacher he immediately attracted unusual attention, and his church was always crowded. His sermons were not constructed after the prescribed scholastic form, and were therefore obnoxious to sticklers for antiquity; but their freshness and enthusiasm rendered them unusually acceptable to the people. There were many *crypto*-Pietists in the neighborhood, and these rejoiced to have found a pastor after their own heart.

Under their influence certain phenomena appeared in the congregation, which are described as similar to those from which the Quakers had derived their name. During religious service the people trembled, and sometimes fell into convulsions. Guldin was never accused of having induced or promoted these phenomena; but one of the most serious charges brought against him was that he had not labored to prevent them.

It so happened that the young men who had been Guldin's fellow-students at Geneva—Koenig, Lutz and Schumacher—had also been appointed to pastoral charges in the canton or city of Berne. They remained his intimate friends and coadjutors, and finally became his companions in suffering and persecution.

For nine months, Guldin tells us in his "Apologie," he was dissatisfied with his position. Though his earlier religious experience had been sufficiently decided, he could not enter fully into the spirit of the place. He had made up his mind to retire, and supposed he had preached his last sermon, when, as he says, "on the 4th of August, 1693, between nine and ten o'clock in the forenoon, the light of faith arose, and was born within me. In that hour all my difficulties and scruples disappeared, so that I was never afterwards affected by them; and I began to preach with new power, so that my whole congregation became aware that a change had taken place in my soul."

Guldin's reputation as a preacher increased rapidly, and on the 26th of December, 1796, he was elected *diaconus*, or, as

we should now say, associate pastor of the minister, the principal church of the neighboring city of Berne. This was regarded as a great triumph by his friends; and on the same day Lutz wrote the following playful, but imprudent letter: "Golden tidings! This day our *golden* brother, Guldin, was elected *diaconus* by a majority of the votes of the Council. Glory to God who doeth wonders! May He anoint the man whom He has ordained! How will it sound in the ears of our enemies? The 'arch-sectarian' is now a city pastor and member of the Ministerium and Council. Thus the stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner. Inform the brethren, so that they may praise God and help us to contend for the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ." This letter unfortunately fell into the hands of the authorities, and was the cause of much trouble.

For more than two years Guldin continued his labors in the minister, preaching also in his turn in the other churches of the city. His popularity increased, and the party which gathered around him became numerous, compact and aggressive. Guldin appears to have been more prudent than his coadjutors; for with all that his enemies could do, it was not proved that he had spoken disrespectfully of dignities. His friend, Koenig, was bolder, and on several occasions sharply criticized the government. The old orthodox party was alarmed, and Guldin, Koenig and Lutz were cited to appear before the Great Council of the canton. Schumacher would no doubt have been included in the citation if he had not suddenly died just before it was issued. The trial was long and tedious; but the result was from the beginning a foregone conclusion. It was not so much certain individuals as Pietism itself that was put on trial; and it was the evident purpose of the party in power to crush the movement at all hazards. The trial was brought to a conclusion on the 9th of June, 1699, by the condemnation of all the parties accused.

It was not until 1718 that Guldin published his "Apology for the unjustly suspected Pietists of Berne." According to the

imprint on the title-page it appeared in Philadelphia, but it is certain that it was not printed in this country. There was no German press in America at that early date. The imprint evidently means that this work, as well as the one which immediately succeeded it, was issued under the auspices of one of the Philadelphian societies, composed of Pietists, which at that time existed in Germany. The place of publication was somewhere in the Rhine country; but it was not desirable that the exact locality should be mentioned, as such publications were regarded as seditious, and were forbidden under heavy penalties.

In his "Apologie" Guldin wisely includes the indictment that was brought against him and his companions, together with the judgment of the court; and then, in a second part, presents his defense, which, from our present point of view, is keen and convincing. Of course, we do not agree with him in what may be called the distinctive features of his Pietism; but to convince the modern reader of the weakness, not to say the positive injustice, of most of the charges, it might have been enough to publish the indictment without note or comment.

To reproduce this verbose legal document, which is called the *Relation*, would be tedious in the extreme. It is composed in the so-called "chancery language" of the times, and is full of legal phrases and repetitions. The charges are supported by numerous specifications, which, however, consist chiefly of insignificant matters, or even of the irresponsible utterances of persons who were not on trial. By way of introduction we have a glorification of Berne for its faithfulness to the doctrines of the Reformation. It is declared to have preserved the truth more perfectly than other Reformed cities, so that Berne is everywhere regarded as a monument of the faith. Now, alas! evil days have come. Pietism has made its way into this happy community, and designing men threaten to subvert the foundations of social order.

The history of the Pietistic movement in Berne is given at length. It is represented as having begun with the "foolish dreams" of a weak-minded woman, and as having been encour-

aged by emissaries from Germany. Finally Guldin and his coadjutors appear on the scene, and for them there is a long list of accusations, each one of which, it was held, was sufficient to secure their condemnation. These charges are grouped under the following heads :

1. *The circulation of improper books.* Books of this kind are classified as heterodox, seditious, fanatical and mystical. As might be expected, they include the writings of Weigel, Poiret, Jane Leade, and the works of the shoemaker, Jacob Boehme, "which," it is said, "no sensible man can understand." The principal charge against Guldin in this connection is that he accepted some of these books as a gift, and did not warn the people against them.

2. *Errors of doctrine.* Certain of the accused asserted that a regenerated person cannot sin; that a Christian may attain to a condition in which all his prayers are thanksgivings, so that his whole life becomes a prayer, and it is not necessary that his devotion should be expressed in words. They also asserted that a man who feels himself to be a sinner should not venture to receive the Lord's Supper. In a sermon on the ministry Guldin had asserted: "A true prophet needs an internal call, by which he not only recognizes and teaches the truth in an external way, but is spiritually illuminated and sanctified." In the same connection he had said: "A man may be regularly ordained and yet be a false prophet, if he has not received an internal call." In a letter to Mr. Laub, July 10, 1697, he wrote: "God has in this place testified to the doctrine of faith by all kinds of signs and wonders, and by the manifest opposition of the world."

3. *Chiliasm.* The accused pastors announced the speedy coming of the millennium—"a doctrine on which theologians are not agreed, and which has not been preached in Switzerland since the days of the Reformation. It is contrary to the Helvetic Confession, and was the favorite theme of John of Leyden and other enthusiasts."

4. *Unmethodical Preaching.* The accused expressed themselves contemptuously with regard to the logical method of

preaching which is taught in the schools. They also occasionally preached in the dialect of the people, which was "not only in bad taste, but actually detracted from the dignity of the service." Instead of instructing their catechumens in the usual manner, by questions and answers, they lectured and exhorted.

5. *Crowding the Churches.* Wherever the accused preached they were followed by a great multitude of people. Especially when "a certain one of their number" preached a large number of country folks attended divine service in the city. "This was subversive of proper discipline, and the Sabbath was thereby profaned. Faithful pastors were brought into disrepute, and their feelings greatly embittered." Guldin and others made no attempt to prevent the gathering of these crowds, but rather seemed to glory in them.

6. *Concerning Trembling.* "Among the disorders recently introduced," says the *Relation*, "is the so-called *Trembling*, which is a peculiarly offensive thing, founded neither on the word of God nor on the proper customs of the Church, closely resembling the quaking of the Quakers in England, and hitherto unknown in our churches since the time of the blessed Reformation." Mr. Guldin, even after the authorities had expressed their disapproval, preached a sermon on the text: "Judge not!" in which he expressed a doubt whether Trembling was the work of God or of Satan. "He ought to have supported the government; otherwise to have kept silent."

7. *Concerning Conventicles.* Meetings had been held without authority, at which psalms were sung and religious subjects considered. On one occasion Anabaptists were present. There was no special charge against Guldin in this connection.

8. *Correspondence with Foreign Pietists.* On this point much material is presented, but most of it is entirely irrelevant. Expressions made in the freedom of private correspondence are tortured and twisted until they are made to convey more than the writers intended. Guldin is, for instance, charged with having written to Laub, March 21, 1698: "Here everything is advancing—there are buds on the vine and shoots on the trees—

ah! who can tell what the fruit will be?" How these words could have been regarded as seriously objectionable it is hard to understand.

The *Relation* occupies thirty pages, concluding with direful prophecies as to the result if the Pietists are suffered to escape unpunished. In our brief sketch of its contents we have followed as nearly as possible the argument of the original. Its weakness is apparent at a glance, and yet it is evident that the parties occupied positions which were decidedly antagonistic. The harsh, traditional orthodoxy of the Council is, to say the least, offensive; while on the other hand the new-born zeal of the Pietists was in danger of leading them into the wildest extravagancies.

Guldin's *Apologie* is long and argumentative. It covers thirty-eight pages and is in great part a plea for "experimental religion." In his introduction he attempts to make it appear that the Reformation of the sixteenth century remained incomplete, and that the time had now come for a great advance. He attempts to prick the bubble of the vanity of the Council by telling them that in foreign countries their orthodoxy is not so highly esteemed as they imagine; and even suggests that they have an account to settle for their merciless persecution of the Anabaptists. Taking up the charges of his accusers *seriatim*, he answers them at length, in most instances acknowledging the facts, but denying the inferences. He says he ~~has~~ never read the works of Jane Leade; * but charges the Council with ignorance for forbidding the people to read the writings of Tauler, which Luther loved. As a minister he claims the privilege of reading whatever he deems proper, and pertinently inquires how he could be expected to refute errors without first becoming acquainted with them. "The Bible says: 'Prove all things;' it does not say: 'Forbid the people to read.'"

The *Apologie* was probably written long after the trial, and was rather an argument for Pietism than a personal defense.

* Jane Leade (1623-1704) founded the Philadelphian Society of London. She was a disciple of Boehme and an extreme Chiliast and Separatist.

The writer denies that the peculiarities of the Pietists are errors; and even insists, on what seem to be insufficient grounds, that their teachings are in full accord with the Heidelberg Catechism and the decrees of the Synod of Berne. He asserts that the doctrine that the regenerate do not commit sin is entirely Scriptural "when properly understood;" but repudiates the charge that Pietists believe that those who are fully sanctified need not pray. Lay-preaching and "conventicles" are justified on the ground of Scriptural prophecy. The peculiar phenomena of Pietism are represented as analogous to the struggles which accompanied the healing of the demoniacs; they are the vain efforts of the evil spirit to retain its ascendancy over the soul which Christ has come to deliver.

The reader who is at all familiar with Pietism, either in its earlier or later form, can have no difficulty in anticipating the course of the arguments. As we read the *Apologie* we feel that the castigation there administered to the authorities of Berne is most thoroughly deserved. We have no sympathy with the narrow-mindedness of men who in a great religious movement are utterly unable to discriminate between its good and evil elements. Their charges, as stated in the *Relation*, were generally trifling, not to say contemptible. On the other hand, the *Apologie* shows us that the accused were not willing to yield an inch to their prosecutors. They were Pietists and proud in it. Under such circumstances compromise could hardly have been thought of; and the trial resulted in the condemnation of the accused.

In the judgment of the council Chaplain Koenig was the chief offender, having spoken disrespectfully of the government. He was accordingly deposed from the ministry and banished from the country. In the cases of Guldin and Lutz the judgment was a little less severe. They were deprived of their pastoral charges and forbidden to teach, either in public or private, or to attend "conventicles," under penalty of deposition from the ministry. If they should agree to renounce Pietism, and to submit to the Helvetic Confessions and the decrees of the Coun-

ed, they might, at the pleasure of the authorities, "be appointed to positions inferior to those which they had hitherto occupied, and as far distant as possible from the city of Berne."

In accordance with this decree, Guldin was conditionally offered an obscure parish in the mountains; but he refused to accept the conditions, and very naturally expressed himself with some freedom concerning the court and its decrees. He was accordingly arrested and imprisoned. How long this imprisonment continued we have not been able to ascertain; but we are informed that on his release he lived for some time in retirement in a village near Berne.* A MS. note by an unknown hand, on our copy of the *Apologie*, states that Guldin was, in 1708, appointed pastor "in der Lengg,"† but was removed the same year, "and then emigrated to Pennsylvania." Our Swiss correspondent is, however, probably more accurate when he says that "he resided for some time in Germany before he removed to America." On this portion of his history we have no information. If Guldin came to this country in 1708 he was by far the earliest Reformed minister in Pennsylvania. It is, however, much more natural to suppose that he remained in Germany until after 1714, publishing his books in defense of the Pietists as a "parting shot." There are no consecutive lists of immigrants prior to 1727, and the date of his arrival cannot, therefore, be accurately determined. It may, however, be assumed that he was accompanied by his family; and as an old Family Bible, now in possession of his descendant, Reuben W. Gullin, explicitly states that his son Samuel was married in May, 1722, and his eldest grandson born in July, 1723, the family must have arrived at an earlier date—these events being known to have occurred in Pennsylvania.‡ We therefore tentatively place

* Letter from Dr. Knoch, Jan. 21, 1882.

† Possibly Lengnau, 17 miles from Berne.

‡ It may be interesting to some of our readers to indicate the line of descent between the Rev. Samuel Guldin, and the late Rev. John C. Guldin, D.D., of New York. The following are the successive generations: 1. Rev. Samuel Guldin, born 1660; 2. Samuel Guldin, Junior, born Nov. 8, 1693; 3. Daniel Guldin, born April 20, 1735; 4. John Guldin, born Oct. 18, 1770; 5. John C. Guldin, born August, 1799.

the date of the arrival of the family between 1718 and 1722, with the probabilities in favor of 1719. Even these dates indicate that Guldin was the earliest ordained Reformed minister in Pennsylvania. Boehm did not begin to preach until 1720, and was ordained in 1729. Weiss arrived in Philadelphia in 1727.

When Guldin arrived in Oley—now in Berks county—he must have been greeted by sympathizing friends. The region is exceedingly fertile, and was accordingly occupied much earlier than the surrounding country. Many of the early settlers were of Huguenot descent, and had brought with them much of the mysticism which was characteristic of French Protestantism in the latter part of the 18th century. There were also many German Pietists, and it is not too much to say that the whole community was for some time greatly influenced by their teachings. “Oley township,” says Rupp,* “was remarkable as a place for religious excitement, at an early period. A singular sect was started there, headed by one Matthias Bowman.” “Bowman’s followers professed sinless perfection—boasting that they were sent of God to conform others. They called themselves ‘*New Born.*’” With such surroundings, it is hardly likely that Guldin felt himself a stranger.

The name of Samuel Guldin appears frequently in early records as a purchaser or owner of lands. In 1729 he became a naturalized subject of the king of Great Britain. An insurmountable difficulty in these instances is found in the fact that father and son bore precisely the same name, so that it becomes impossible to distinguish between them.

It is known that Samuel Guldin took up 200 acres of land and paid for them. The land was well chosen, and is now divided into several excellent farms. The family tradition describes him as a successful and enterprising farmer—a pioneer in the best sense of the word. He is also said to have preached frequently and acceptably, and to have administered the sacraments, though without a regular charge. This tradition we believe to be reliable; for apart from the fact that when Guldin arrived in

* History of Berks and Lebanon counties, p. 233.

this country there were no Reformed churches which might have claimed his services, his recollections of the established Church of Switzerland were hardly of such a nature as to render him enthusiastic for its foundation in America. As he was known to be a minister he was, no doubt, often requested to preach, especially at funerals, and to administer the sacraments. The community in which he lived was not at first sufficiently harmonious in religious matters to unite in building a church; and Rupp says, on the authority of Loskiel, that as late as 1742, there was no church in Oley.* Schlatter mentions the church of Oley† as existing in 1751;‡ but as he does not include it in his list of organized charges, it seems probable that it had been recently founded. As Guldin died before Schlatter's arrival in this country his name does not appear in the "Journal."

For many years Guldin was chiefly occupied as a farmer; but there is evidence to show that he was profoundly interested in the religious movements of the times. At Ephrata, in the neighboring county of Lancaster, Conrad Beissel had founded a monastic society of Seventh-Day Baptists, which was called the Order of the Solitary. In 1728 Beissel published his "Ninety-nine Mystical Sayings," one of the earliest of his publications. Concerning this publication the *Chronicon Ephratense* says: "When a learned scholar, named Gulde, saw them he traveled to him, and asked him why he had made 99 of them and not 100. His answer was, that as the number 99 was reached he was stopped in the Spirit. Then he asked him (Beissel) why he observed the Sabbath. The answer: That he had experienced that whenever the Sabbath came all his burdens, which rested on him during the week, were removed, which did not happen to him on Sundays. Against this

* History of Berks and Lebanon Counties, p. 223.

† As early as 1736 Henry Antes ministered to the Reformed people of Oley. "It is not certain that he preached at this time, but he went from house to house and led the people in singing and prayer.—"Historic Manual," p. 191.

‡ Schlatter's "Journal," p. 204.

he (Guldin) had no objections to make, and went his way edified." *

We may not implicitly trust the chronicler's report of this conversation, but it at least appears from the passage that Guldin was brought into contact with the Ephrata Brethren.

Guldin's last publication appeared in 1743. It was mainly directed against the movement for the union of all the German churches of Pennsylvania, which resulted in the organization of "The Congregation of God in the Spirit." This movement had begun in Oley, where John Adam Gruber—a member of the sect called "The Inspired"—had, as early as 1738, issued an address calling for some sort of union. The idea was taken up by Henry Antes and others, and under the patronage of Count Zinzendorf it for awhile promised to exert a powerful influence in favor of Christian unity.† Six Synods were held, composed of members of various churches, "who were able to give a reason for the faith that was in them."

As the most important of these Synods was held in Oley by men whose religious views were thoroughly "pietistic," it might be supposed that Guldin would have taken an active part in the new "congregation." On the contrary, he felt moved in his old age to protest against it, and wrote a little book which left no doubt with regard to his position. He had never been an extreme Pietist, and now, after years of reflection, he did not hesitate to warn Christians against fanaticism. He was not one of those who cried, "Come forth out of Babel!" Some of his views were still sufficiently curious, but they were mild indeed when compared with the extravagancies of some of his neighbors. He declared himself favorable to Christian unity, but insisted that Count Zinzendorf's movement was purely mechanical and intended chiefly for the aggrandizement of an individual.

Guldin's book is composed of five parts, which appear to have been originally circulated as separate tracts. The titles

* *Chronicon Ephratense*, English version, p. 43.

† "Historic Manual," p. 192.

of the several parts may be translated as follows: 1. Balm of Gilead poured on the wounds and injuries of all Religious Sects and Parties in Pennsylvania and all Christendom. 2. Concerning False Prophets; 3. Concerning the true doctrine and servants of Christ; 4. Well-meant Reflections; 5. Concerning the Conduct of James Davenport.*

The volume published by Guldin in America was in some respects inferior to his European publications. The fact may have been due to the infirmity of old age; or possibly the hand that held the plow had lost its cunning in guiding the pen; but it is evident at a glance that, for scholarship, vigor and style this book is not to be compared with the productions of his earlier years.

Christopher Saur's paper, published in Germantown Jan. 16, 1746, contains the following brief notice: "*Der sonst von vielen Jahren her bekannte Samuel Guldin ist in Philadelphia den Tag vorm neuen Jahr gestorben im 81 ten Jahr seines Alters.*" As tradition is clear in asserting that he lies buried in the family graveyard in Oley, it may, perhaps, be taken for granted that he was on a visit in Philadelphia at the time of his death, and that his body was taken home for interment. The obituary is far too short for our present purposes, but it at any rate reveals the fact that Guldin was for many years well known by his contemporaries, and fixes the date of his death as the 31st of December, 1745.

Much of what we have said is founded on the comparison of isolated facts and dates, and may be subject to revision; but the main outlines of his career have, we think, been sufficiently determined. That he remained a Pietist is evident from his latest publication; but he was not a fanatic. Carried away in his youth by a great religious movement, he remained attached

*James Davenport (1716-1757) was prominent in the revival which is known as "the great awakening." He destroyed by fire wigs, fine garments, jewels, etc., "in order to cure the people of their idolatrous love of worldly things." Guldin does not approve of his peculiarities, but pleads that he should be kindly treated on account of his evident sincerity.—Appleton's "Cyclopædia of American Biography," II, p. 84.

fundamental principles, but learned to avoid its extravaganzas. Though he had been persecuted by orthodox bigots, never identified himself with any one of the sectarian movements which were in his days so numerous in Pennsylvania. Brought up his children in the faith of the Reformed Church, and preached the Gospel and administered the Sacraments according to her ancient usages. By his contemporaries he was regarded as a minister whose personal character was irreproachable; and he, therefore, deserves an honorable position in the history of the church from whose standards, according to his own assertion, he never departed.

IV.

THE PENTATEUCH.

THE ARTICLE OF JULIUS WELLHAUSEN.

REVIEWED BY H. P. LAIRD, ESQ.

IN the 18th Vol. of the 9th Edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, under the heading of "PENTATEUCH," the distinguished Professor of Oriental Literature, in the University of Halle, Julius Wellhausen, has furnished for the public at large, an exhaustive criticism on the Pentateuch; and, also, a history of the previous state of the discussion on the same subject.

He arrays against the traditional belief in the authenticity of the Pentateuch, two lines of argument: one negative, the other positive; and a large portion of the article is devoted to proving that the Pentateuch was not all written by one hand.

The whole theory of the Christian religion, the synagogue, and the Tabernacle, presupposes a divine revelation from the beginning, down to the last of the prophets.—Heb. 1st chapter, 1st verse; Luke 1st, 70th verse.

Why, then, should there not be a record of these inspired revelations down to the age of Moses?

They lose nothing by having the stamp of his inspired authority, and for us who have no other means of verifying them, than the authority of Moses, they are as really Mosaic as if every sentence they contain had been written with his own hand; and, that nothing might be wanting to induce the utmost confidence in a document authenticated by Moses, this great lawgiver, has the endorsement of the Redeemer of the world.

What more is wanting to establish the authenticity of the Pentateuch?

In the affairs of human life, ancient writings, resting on much less authority than the Mosaic record, would not be permitted to be questioned in any court of justice in Christendom.

The Roman Emperor, Justinian, appointed a commission with Tribonius at its head, to report a digest of the Roman law.

He stamped their report with his imperial authority, and repealed all earlier laws, not contained in this report; and, for more than thirteen hundred years no lawyer has been heard in any court of justice to question the verity or the authority of the laws contained in this digest of the civil law; the Roman law, thus abbreviated, was partly re-written by the commission; and, again, whole pages of the old law were copied, word for word, from the most ancient manuscripts, in the very language of the times in which it was first written.

If the history of this remarkable transaction was lost, critics of the Tübingen school could prove by linguistic comparisons, that no part of the digest was written until the age of Justinian; or, if this was found unsatisfactory, that it had all been written before the age of the Cæsars, and that the more modern Latin found in the Digest was an interpolation of a later age.

We are informed by the learned Professor, that De Wette, one of the early critics, found that the Pentateuch was not authority for the history of the time in which it was written; it is, he says, "the conditions of that much later time which the author idealizes and throws back into the past, whether in the form of narrative or of law."

The learned Professor eulogizes the performance of De Wette; but admits that he had gone too far. Whatever the ability of De Wette may have been as a critic, his conclusions were too improbable to require any refutation.

Professor Wellhausen allows Moses a place in the Pentateuch; but credits the larger portion of it to a later age.

He admits that it is referred to in 2d Chron. 25th, and 4th

and 35th, and 12th, under the designation, the "Book of Moses."

He might, also, have cited from the same book and for the same purpose, the 34th chapter and 14th verse, where it is called "a book of the law of the Lord by the hand of Moses," and verse 30th, where it is called "the book of the covenant."

It would have been fatal to the hypothesis of the learned Professor if he had admitted that Moses was referred to as the author of the Pentateuch from the days of Joshua down to the age of King Josiah; and, hence, he skillfully and with assumed candor says: "Moses is already taken for the author of the Pentateuch in 2d Chron., etc., a book which he contends was written after the exile.

Let us just here turn to some of the references which Wellhausen has purposely omitted:

Joshua 8 chap., 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35 verses;
 Joshua 18 chap., 15, 21, 24, 29 and 33 verses;
 Joshua 14 chap., 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 verses;
 Joshua 20 chap., 1 and 2 verses;
 Joshua 22 chap., 4, 5, 28 and 29 verses;
 Joshua 24 chap., 26 verse;
 1 Judges 3 chap., 4 verse;
 1 Samuel 12 chap., 6 and 8 verses;
 1 Kings 2 chap., 3 verse;
 1 Kings 8 chap., 9, 53, 56 verses;
 2 Kings 14 chap., 6 verse;
 2 Kings 18 chap., 6 and 12 verses, and 21 chap., 8 verse.

The following quotations from Professor Wellhausen's article will disclose the conclusions he assumes to have arrived at.—*Ency. Britannica*, Vol. 18, page 512:

"The greater part of the narrative of the Pentateuch cannot be measured by an historical standard; but, within certain limits, that standard can be applied to the special age of Moses and Joshua. . . .

"It is asked, for example, what is left for Moses, if he was not the author of the Torah.

"But Moses may have been the founder of the Torah, though the Pentateuchal legislation was codified, almost a thou-

and years later; for the Torah was originally not a written law, but the oral decisions of the priests at the sanctuary—case law in short—by which they decided all manner of questions and controversies that were brought before their tribunal; their Torah was the instructions to others that came from their lips, not at all a written document in their hands, guaranteeing their own status and instructing themselves how to proceed in the official ritual. . . .

“But while it was only at a late date that the ritual appeared in the Torah, as it does in the priestly code, its usages and traditions are exceedingly ancient, going back, in fact, to pre-Mosaic and heathenish times.”

It will be observed that no evidence is adduced to sustain these conjectures; the learned professor, however, apparently conscious of the fact that these statements do not rest on adequate evidence; but only on conjecture, on page 510 in the same article draws the following grave inferences:

“Hence, we conclude that the priests’ code builds on the realization of the object aimed at in Deuteronomy; and, therefore, belongs to the times after the exile when this object had been fully secured. . . .

“Ezekiel’s ideas and aims are entirely in the same direction as the priestly code, and yet, he plainly does not know the code himself.” (A bold assumption from which the author draws his conclusions as follows:) “This can only mean that in his day it did not exist, and that his ordinances formed one of the steps that prepared the way for it. Page 514.

“This code, incorporated in the Pentateuch, and forming the narrative part of its legislation, became the definitive Mosaic law.

“As such it was published and put in action 444 B. C., by the Babylonian priest and scribe, Ezra, . . . just as we are told (2 Kings, 22 chap.) that Deuteronomy became known in 621 B. C., *having been unknown previously*; so we are told here that the Torah in the rest of the Pentateuch became known in 444, and was unknown till that date.

"This shows us in the first place that Deuteronomy contains an earlier stage of the law than the priestly Torah; and, further, as the date of Deuteronomy can be inferred from the date of its publication and introduction under Josiah, so, in like manner, the date of the composition of the priestly code, can be inferred from its publication and enforcement by Ezra and Nehemiah."

From the quotations already made we discover the sandy foundation on which Professor Wellhausen bases his argument, that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch.

In the eighteenth year of King Josiah he sent Shaphan to Hilkiash, the high priest, to give directions how the money which had been collected at the Temple should be applied towards the expense of repairing the breaches in the Temple, and on this occasion, 621 B. C., the high priest, who no doubt had already made some progress in repairing the Temple, said to Shaphan, the king's secretary, "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord, and Hilkiash gave the book to Shaphan, and he read it;" and upon his reading it to the king he was greatly moved by the denunciations it contained against idolatry, and because Israel had not hearkened "unto the words of the book to do in accordance with all that is prescribed concerning us." 2 Kings, 23 chap., 21-22 verses.

"And the King commanded all the people, saying, Keep the Passover unto the Lord your God, as it is written in this book of the covenant.

"For there had not been holden such a passover from the days of the judges that judged Israel, and of the Kings of Judah."

From these latter verses an inference arises that before and during the time of the Judges the passover had been kept in accordance with the directions contained in the "Book of the Covenant" of the Lord, which Hilkiash, the high priest, had discovered in the process of repairing the breaches of the Temple; and that consequently the Book of the Covenant of the Lord (which our author calls Deuteronomy), must have been previously known.

It is, therefore, a surprise that Professor Wellhausen should have drawn from the same facts an opposite inference.

The discovery of this book is conclusive evidence that it must have had an existence before it was discovered; and if it existed before that time the natural inquiry would be, how long before that time did it exist, and were its contents known at an earlier period?

Instead of prosecuting this inquiry, the learned professor says, in his authoritative way, "*having been unknown previously.*" And yet there is no logical connexion arising from the fact of finding the book which would authorize the conclusion drawn from this fact that it had not been previously known. Having discovered this breach of continuity between the fact and the illogical conclusion drawn from it by Professor Wellhausen, I am reluctantly constrained to insist on *some evidence* of a fact, even when advanced by so distinguished a writer as Professor Wellhausen, before I can accept his mere unsupported assertions as any evidence whatever.

But on what ground does the professor undertake with apocryphic certainty to say that "the Book of the Covenant," which was found in the Temple, was the book of Deuteronomy, rather than Exodus or that of the Pentateuch?

No evidence whatever is adduced to sustain this assertion; amounts, therefore, to a mere conjecture, because the injunction to observe the passover is as strongly insisted on in the book of Exodus as it is in the Book of Deuteronomy.

In 2d Chron. 35th ch., and 6th verse, King Josiah, after the book of the Covenant was found, gave directions in regard to celebrating the passover, as follows:

"So kill the Passover and sanctify yourselves, and prepare our brethren that they may do according to the word of the Lord, by the hand of Moses."

And again, in verse 12th, it is said, "as it is written in the Book of Moses." And in the 18th verse it is said, "and there was no Passover like to that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the Prophet."

It is highly probable that Solomon, when he built the Temple, 1012 B. C., caused either the original or a copy of the Pentateuch to be securely enclosed in one of the stones of the Temple, or in cement, and built into some portion of the wall just as it is done in our day, when copies of the Bible are placed in the corner-stones of our churches.

And if it was the original, "by the hand of Moses," the finding of the Book, 391 years after it had been deposited there, will account for much of the emotion felt by Josiah; and as our Pentateuch is substantially a copy of this ancient book, "by the hand of Moses," we are brought much nearer to the awful realities of Sinai than is generally supposed.

The learned Professor, and those who train with him, insist on a Hexateuch, rather than a Pentateuch, and include the Book of Joshua in the Pentateuch; the reason for this appears obvious; the Book of Joshua is a witness for Moses, and the Pentateuch, and by including this book in the number of those assailed, Moses and the Pentateuch are intended to be deprived of the earliest witnesses to the authenticity of the Mosaic record.

After disposing of the Book of Deuteronomy in the manner above indicated, our author proceeds to divide the residue of the Pentateuch into two sections, which he names respectively the Priestly Code and the Jehovist.

According to Wellhausen, the first chapter of Genesis is to be classified with the Priestly Code, and the second chapter of Genesis with the Jehovist division, and then Professor Wellhausen proceeds to point out alleged contradictions between first Genesis and second Genesis.

It will here be in order to consider the value of these objections.

There is a striking and remarkable unity pervading the whole of the Pentateuch; so much so, that the attempt to sunder it, fairly taxes and masters the utmost ingenuity of the learned critic.

The sections or paragraphs in first and second Genesis in our English Bibles should have been so divided that the second chapter would begin with the fourth verse.

There is nothing in the second chapter following the fourth and fifth verses to which the word *elleh*, "these," can be referred, and as the word *elleh* in Hebrew, as often refers to what went before, as to what follows, we must permit it here to refer to a preceding clause or to an omitted paragraph in the second chapter substantially of the same import as the narrative of the creation in the first verse of the first chapter.

In giving a brief summary of the "*toledoth*" of the first chapter, something is added in this chapter of great scientific value, in reference to the primeval condition of the atmosphere. Until the whole atmospheric belt which surrounds the earth was saturated with the evaporations from the earth and sea, no rains, as we have them now, could fall; but until this saturation took place, the earth was watered with the mists, which arose in the day-time, and fell at night, as dew.

The narrative following the first chapter, runs thus: "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth in their being created; in the day that the Lord God created earth and the heavens, and every shrub of the forest, *terem*, before it was in the earth, and every plant of the field, *terem*, before it grew, for the Lord God had not rained on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground; but a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground."

In the face of such explicit reference to the creative operations of the first day recorded in first Genesis, the learned Professor makes, on page 507, the following statement:

"The history of the first man in Paradise, has nothing to do with the preceding record of the creation of the world in six days which is neither referred to nor presupposed."

The three instances that I have already adduced, namely, the assertions of the author "that Deuteronomy became known in 21 B.C., *having been unknown previously*;" and that "the *Torah* in the rest of the Pentateuch became known in 444, and *was unknown till that date*."

Together with his assertion just quoted, that "the history of the first man in Paradise has nothing to do with the preceding

record of the creation of the world in six days, which is neither referred to nor presupposed," constrain us, however reluctantly, to come to the conclusion, that the judgment of the learned writer falls immeasurably beneath the standard of both his scholarship and his position as a teacher in a distinguished university.

After referring to so much of the contents of the first chapter of Genesis, as was necessary to show that the second chapter was a continuation in greater detail of the creation of man, and of the provision which was made for his sustenance and happiness, the narrative of the second chapter proceeds:

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul; and the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed; and out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of Life, also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of Knowledge of good and evil; and a river (stream) went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted and became into four heads [and became tributary to a quaternion of great rivers.]"

In speaking of the foregoing narrative, on page 507, the learned Professor drops the words which constitute the beginning of the sentence, "these are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created," and starts in the middle of the sentence, "In the day that Jehovah made the earth there was, as yet, no plant of the field upon the earth, and no herb grew in the field, for Jehovah had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground; but a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground.

"And Jehovah formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life."

The representation of this narrative by the learned Professor is altogether different from that manifest on the face of the record.

“These” (the account of the creative operations described in the first chapter) “are the generations of the heavens and the earth in their being created, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven, and every shrub of the forest, *terem*, before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field, *terem*, before it grew, for the Lord God had not rained on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground.”

The reference is to the early creative operations described in the first chapter, including the divine fiat which caused the earth to be clothed with vegetation before it had rained and before there was any man to till the ground.

All this is a rational and appropriate introduction to the detailed narrative of the creation of man, which is connected with the preceding part of the narrative by *wav*, connective, to preserve the continuity of the narrative, which connective in the authorized English translation is rendered, *but*.

Thus: “But there went up a mist from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground, *adamah*. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.”

The text, in its entirety, recites that the preceding or some other narrative gave an account of the Genesis of the heavens and of the earth, and of vegetation anterior to its natural growth.

By omitting a part of the recital, the learned Professor makes this narrative to affirm that,—“In the day that Jehovah made the earth there was, as yet, no plant of the field upon the earth, and no herb grew in the field.”

One is a recital of a preceding account of the creation; the other is an independent affirmation of a fact relative to the creation.

The difference between the statement in the text and the Professor's version of it is manifest.

One gives full force to the demonstrative pronoun *elleh*; the other omits and disregards it, so as to make good the assertion of the learned critic that “the history of the first man in Para-

dise has nothing to do with the preceding record of the creation of the world in six days, which is neither referred to nor presupposed."

To further illustrate the want of accuracy and logical precision in this article of Professor Wellhausen, I quote as follows from page 507: "There (chapter 1st) man is made last of all, but here first of all; before vegetation and according to 3 sq.; also before the beasts. . . . Gen. 1st has Elohim; Gen. 2nd and 3rd, Jehovah. Gen. 1st has the technical word *bara*, 'create,' while the other narrative uses the ordinary word *asa*, 'make,' *yatsar*, 'formed,' etc."

A careful examination of the Hebrew text of Gen. 1st and 2nd will refute all these latter objections.

The name Elohim, for God, occurs eleven times from the 4th to the 25th and last verse of Genesis 2nd, in connexion with the word *yah-we*, Jehovah. And in the 4th verse of the 2nd chapter the infinitive constructive of the verb *bara* is used: "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, *bibaram*, in their creation, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven."

In reviewing the criticism of the learned Professor on the Pentateuch, we can afford to be quite irenical; many of his objections are so superficial that one feels like asking pardon for consuming time in refuting them. It is not the weight of the criticisms, but the distinguished position of Professor Wellhausen as a teacher at the University of Halle, which invites a review of his criticism of the Pentateuch.

But the learned Professor further says: "There (in ch. 1) man is made last of all; but here (in ch. 2) first of all, before vegetation, and . . . before the beasts." As to the second of these assertions, it will only be necessary to refer the reader to the narrative of the 2nd chapter, and he will find the representation there refutes the objection; the learned critic refers as specifically to the 19th verse, *et sequens*, of this 2nd chapter; but upon turning to the passage to which we are referred, we find nothing there to sustain the point made.

The first chapter furnished a definite chronology of the order of creation ; the second supplements it with unchronological details which would have been out of place in an exact statement.

Perhaps no competent judge will be disposed to differ with the learned Professor in his estimate of the variance in diction and style of the two narratives when he says: "Gen. 1st is confined by a precise and formal scheme, while in Gen. 2 and 3 it has a free poetic movement." And it might have been added with strict propriety that the conception of both is absolutely original, and that neither the facts narrated nor the attendant circumstances of either are beneath the dignity of the self-existent Sovereign of the universe; and that even after the lapse of unnumbered ages these narratives have a perennial freshness which relegate them to a source higher and greater than human.

The learned author makes several verbal criticisms and among others the following, Gen. 12 and 6th verse, "*The Canaanite was then in the land is spoken to readers who had long forgotten that a different nation from Israel had once occupied the Holy Land.*"

This is a stupid criticism.

If Abraham or a contemporary writer, in describing his journey into Palestine where earlier Canaanite settlers were found, should add, that the Canaanite was then in the land, this would be quite natural, and an important historical incident which an historian ought not to omit; from such a statement, no inference could be drawn such as the learned Professor makes.

Moreover, the Hebrew particle rendered "then," is *az*; Gesenius in Lexicon, page 28, says of this particle "*az*," A demonstr. part. originally of place, *in that place*, "there."

This particle is also used in the Old Testament as a designation of time.

The translator in considering the whole paragraph must decide whether the adverb *then* or *there* would be most agreeable to the context.

It so happens here, that either of them seem to harmonise with the context. If we adopt the latter, the whole paragraph will read thus: "And Abraham passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the grove of Moreh; and the Canaanite was there in the land."

Under the circumstances indicated it was hypercritical for the learned Professor on such slender footing to attempt to impute to the Mosaic record a date subsequent to the Exile.

We learn from 10th Gen. 19th, that the descendants of Canaan, the youngest son of Ham, were settled on the coast of the Mediterranean at Zidon and Gaza, at a very early period, and when Abraham left Haran, crossed the Jordan, and advanced into the interior of Palestine, as far as the grove of Moreh, and there first met the Canaanites, who were pushing eastward, it would be most natural for him or his historian to record the fact that the Canaanite was *as*, there in the land, or if it is preferred to say, that "the Canaanite was then in the land," that is, in the interior of the land, having advanced from the sea coast.

Again, we are referred to Gen. 36th ch., 31st v., "These are the kings that reigned in Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," and of these words the learned critic says, "they have no prophetic aspect; they point to an author who wrote under the Hebrew monarchy." Very true; for not only these words, but also the whole of the genealogies of the descendants of Esau found in the 36th chapter of Genesis, are placed there from the 1st chapter of the 1st book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel.

At the close of the book of Deuteronomy, and after an account of the death of Moses, in the last chapter there is found this tribute to his pre-eminence above all the prophets: "And there arose not a prophet since, in Israel, like unto Moses who the Lord knew face to face."

In reference to this statement the learned Professor says: "The writer is necessarily one who looked back to Moses through a long series of later prophets."

The book of Deuteronomy closed with the death of Moses, and the facts narrated from the 4th to the 12th and last verse of the 36th chapter were undoubtedly added by a later hand, for we have in the last eight verses an account of the age of Moses, his death and miraculous burial, the mourning that was made for him in the plains of Moab, and, in connection with the foregoing estimate of his prophetic character, the further fact, "that no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." But all this did not in the least touch the integrity and authenticity of the text.

These *addenda* on their face give notice that they were added at a later date, as much as if they had appeared on the margin. They take the place of a foot note, impose on no one, for they give notice that they were added at a later date than that of the events narrated in the body of the text.

On page 507 the learned Professor says, "The conception of the two narratives are different all through, as appears equally in what follows, 'Jehovah planted a garden eastward in Eden, at a point where the four chief rivers of the world are parted from a common source.

" 'Here among other goodly trees, grew the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge.

" 'In this garden Jehovah set the man, to crop it and to keep it, to eat of all the fruits, save only that of the Tree of Knowledge.'

"In chapter 1 man receives from the first as his portion, the whole great earth as he now occupies it; and his task is a purely natural one; be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it.

"But in chapter 2 the first man is placed in a mysterious garden of God, with a very limited sphere, where all is supernatural and marvelous.

"To speak generally, the ideas of God and man in chapter 1 are rational and enlightened, but bare and prosaic; in chapters 2 and 3 they are childlike and primitive, but full of meaning.

"The point of the contrast is mainly this: in Gen. 2, 3, man is in fact forbidden to lift the veil of things, and know the world, represented by the Tree of Knowledge; in Gen. I this is his primary task, to rule over all the earth, for sovereignty and knowledge come to the same thing.

"There nature is to man almost a marvel; here it is a mere thing, an object for him, there it is robbery for man to seek to be as God; here God from the first created man in His own image, after His likeness, and appointed him His vicegerent on earth; with these incongruities in the substance and spirit of the two sections, we must take also the difference of form and language observable alike in the whole manner of the narrative, which in Genesis first is confined by a precise and formal scheme, while in Genesis second and third it has a free poetic movement and in individual expressions."

This statement contains a mixture of truth and of error.

A description of the architecture of the universe and the created things of the earth required a formal scheme.

The blessing is general, universal, and in harmony with the other great events narrated.

Be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth and subdue it.

Have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowl of the heavens, and every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

There is nothing in the second and third chapters which is in conflict with any of the commands of the Creator, in chapter 1, or in restraint of the enjoyment of the gift bestowed.

The great world at large so freely and generously given grew no tree of Life, and no tree of the Knowledge of good and evil. *Tob* and *Ra*.

These sublime symbols, planted in the Garden of Eden, at the hand of God, pointed the beholder to the mysteries of Life and Death in the spiritual world, which, still unsolved, agitate the hopes and fears of all the children of men.

In the state of Adam's innocence the fruit of the tree of Life was not prohibited.

The waters, the trees and flowers, and everything that grew were at his disposal, save only the tree of the Knowledge of good and evil. *Tob* and *Ra*.

The learned Professor, in order to make a contradiction between the first chapter and the second and third chapters, inadvertently or viciously changes the text of the second and third chapters, for he says :

“Here among other goodly trees, grew the tree of Life, and the tree of Knowledge,” omitting the qualifying words of *good* and *evil*. And again, “to eat of all the fruits, save only that of the tree of Knowledge,” again omitting the qualifying words of *good* and *evil*. And again in Genesis second and third, “man is forbidden to lift the veil of things and know the world, represented by the tree of Knowledge,” again, omitting of *good* and *evil*.

No tree of Knowledge is spoken of in the text other than that of the tree of *Knowledge of good and evil*.

The learned Professor is equally unfortunate in saying that the “world, (is) represented” by this fatal tree.

Taken in connection with the prohibition it represented sin and death.

The language of the prohibition was positive and unmistakable, “for on the day that thou eatest thereof, *moth tamuth*, thou shalt die.”

The sentence of death fell on Adam for himself and as the representative of the whole race to spring from him by natural generation, and this marvellous transaction has been recorded comes down to us through all the ages, because it concerns every individual of the human race.

Accept without hesitation the teachings of science, that the minutest particle of matter is acted upon and its movement if it move, swayed and directed by the sum of all the forces in the universe, although the chain which binds them is as weak as the wind; we know that from the lowest to the highest forms of vegetable life, these are dependent on the great orb of day for life and for full development, and some

of them, in mute adoration, with upturned faces, salute the first glimpse of morning light, and follow the circuit of the sun until darkness hides him from view.

From a consideration of these physical facts, so obvious, we rise by an easy gradation to the conception that for the soul of man there is, external to himself, an inexhaustible beneficent fountain necessary to its complete development.

The contention about human freedom and divine sovereignty, is perhaps best reconciled by assuming that within certain limits fixed by the Creator, man is free; that beyond this human circle of freedom, God is absolutely sovereign.

Many things were granted to our first parents, while only one thing was forbidden.

The prohibited tree of *die Wissenschaft* of good and evil, notwithstanding its varied attractions was the first authoritative revelation of God's sovereignty; an objective illustration that in the constitution of things the individual will must conform to the Supreme will, or suffer the consequences involved in the divine sentence, *moth tamuth*, dying thou shalt die.

On pages 509 and 510, the learned Professor says, "The turning point in the history of worship in Israel, is the centralization of the cultus in Jerusalem by *Josiah* (2 Kings: 22, 23.) Till then there were in Judah, as there had been before in Samaria, a multitude of local sanctuaries, the *legitimacy of which no one dreamt of disputing*.

If Hezekiah made an attempt to abolish these local shrines, as we are told in 2 Kings 18: 4-22, it is yet plain that this attempt was not very serious as it had been quite forgotten less than a hundred years later.

Josiah's reforms were the first that went deep enough to leave a mark on history.

Not indeed, that the high places fell at one blow; they rose again after the King's death, and the attachment to them finally disappeared only when the Babylonian exile tore the nation from its ancestral soil, and forcibly interrupted its traditional customs.

The returning exiles were thoroughly imbued with the ideas of Josiah's reform, and had no thought of worshiping except in Jerusalem; it cost them no sacrifice of their feelings to leave the ruined high-places unbuilt.

From this date, all Jews understood as a matter of course, that the one God had only one sanctuary.

Thus we have three distinct historical periods: 1. The period before Josiah; 2. The transition period introduced by Josiah's reforms; and 3. The period after the exile.

Can we trace a correspondence between these three historical phases and the laws as to worship?

I. The principal law book embodied by the Jehovist, the so-called book of the covenant, takes it for granted in Exodus 24: 24-26 (should be 21 and 23) that altars are many, not one.

Here there is no idea of attaching value to the retention of a single place for the altar; earth and rough stones are to be found everywhere, and an altar of these materials fell into ruins as easily as it is built; again, a choice of materials is given presumably for the construction of different altars, and Jehovah proposes to come to His worshipers and bless them, not in *the* place where He causes his name to be celebrated, but at every such altar.

The Jehovistic law, therefore, agrees with the customary usage of the earlier period of Hebrew history; and, so, too, does the Jehovistic story according to which the patriarchs, wherever they reside, erect altars, and set up cippi (*maçceboth*); plant trees and dig wells. . . . The altar which Abraham built at Shechem is the same on which sacrifices still continued to be offered; Jacob's anointed stone at Bethel was still anointed, rites were still offered at it in fulfillment of vows, in the writer's own generation.

The things which a later generation deemed offensive and heathenish, high places, *maçceboth*, sacred trees and wells, all appear now as consecrated by patriarchal precedent, and the narrative can only be understood as a picture of what daily

took place in the first century or thereabouts, after the division of the kingdom *thrown back into the past* and clothed with ancient authority.

II. The Deuteronomic legislation begins (Deut. 12) just like the book of the Covenant with a law for the place of worship.

But now there is a complete change; Jehovah is to be worshiped only in Jerusalem, *and no where else*.

The new law-book is never weary of repeating this command and developing its consequences in every direction.

All this is directed against current usage, against what we are accustomed to do at this day; the law is polemic and aims at reformation.

This law, therefore, belongs to the second period of the history, *the time when the party of reform in Jerusalem was attacking the high places*.

When we read, then, that King Josiah was moved to destroy the local sanctuaries by the discovery of a law-book, this book, assuming it to be preserved in the Pentateuch, can be none other than the legislative part of Deuteronomy which must once have had a separate existence, in a shorter form, than the present book of Deuteronomy; this, too, is the inference to which we are led by the citations and references in Kings and Jeremiah."

III. "In the priestly code all worship depends on the tabernacle; and would fall to nothing apart from it.

"The tabernacle is simply a means of putting the law of unity of worship in an historical form; it is the only legitimate sanctuary; there is no other spot where God dwells and shows Himself; no other where man can approach God and seek His face with sacrifice and gifts. . . .

"Hence, we conclude that the priestly code builds on the realization of the object aimed at in Deuteronomy; and, therefore, belongs to the time after the exile, when this object had been fully secured."

This long extract from the article of the learned professor is

ingenious, and admirably calculated to mislead the weak and half-educated.

He assumes that Jerusalem is designated in 12th Deuteronomy as the one place of worship, when that nowhere appears.

There is not the slightest evidence of moral indignation against the fraud which the author assumes that he has exposed.

The argument by which this feat has been accomplished is drawn in large measure from the Pentateuch itself, and must, therefore, rest on a solid basis.

Such is the mirror which the learned professor holds up to our view; and, while exposing the fraud, the learned author also, without emotion or remark, brings into discredit the serried ranks of pious and learned men, Jews and Christians, who, for more than three thousand years have accepted the Pentateuch as a genuine and authentic document, and the man Moses as its author.

How has this remarkable result been reached?

If a writer is permitted to make the facts as he goes along, or if not that, if he is permitted to mold admitted facts to suit the exigency of his argument, or if it is allowed that he may, unchallenged, draw conclusions not warranted by the facts, then we can easily see how any desired results could be worked out.

The author says: "Till then (the reign of Josiah) there were in Judah, as there had been before in Samaria a multitude of local sanctuaries, the *legitimacy of which no one dreamt of disputing.*"

This sweeping remark is made for the purpose of discrediting the charge of Moses to the children of Israel, recorded in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy.

"These are the statutes and ordinances which ye shall observe to do in the land which the Lord the God of thy fathers giveth unto thee to possess it, all the days that ye live upon the earth.

"Ye shall utterly destroy all the places whereon the nations, which ye are about to drive out served their gods, upon the

high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree, and ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their statues, and their groves shall ye burn with fire; and the graven images of their gods shall ye hew down, and ye shall destroy their name out of the same place.

"Ye shall not do so unto the Lord your God, but unto the place which the Lord your God may choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye repair, and thither shalt thou come, . . . ye shall not do after all the manner that we do here this day; every one whatsoever is right in his own eyes.

"For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord thy God giveth thee. . . .

"Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place which thou mayest see.

"But in the place which the Lord will choose in one of thy tribes, there shalt thou offer thy burnt offerings, and there shalt thou do all that I command thee."

Book of Joshua 5th chapter, 10th verse. The first passover was observed on the plains of Jericho at Gilgal.

Joshua, 18th chapter: The whole congregation of the children of Israel removed from Jericho, and set up the Tabernacle, which was first erected in the Wilderness, at Shiloh; and there the Ark of the Covenant was placed, and remained there a long time, until it was carried into the army and captured by the Philistines in the latter days of Eli, the prophet.

The Reubenites, the Gadites and the half tribe of Manasseh had obtained their possessions on the east side of the Jordan; but the men of war passed over the Jordan with the other tribes of Israel to assist in the conquest of the land of Canaan; and when this was accomplished, Joshua dismissed them to their own possessions (Joshua, 22d chapter) enjoining on them to observe all the commandments, and the law which Moses, the servant of the Lord, had commanded. And when, after leaving Shiloh, they came to the district of the Jordan, they erected there a great altar; and when the children of Israel

heard of this the whole congregation assembled at Shiloh to go up against them to war, and the children of Israel sent Phinehas, the son of Eleazer the priest, and with him ten of the princes of Israel to the children of Reuben and of Gad and of the half tribe of Manasseh, and addressed them as follows (verse 16):

“Thus saith the whole congregation of the Lord, what trespass is this that ye have committed against the God of Israel to turn away this day from following the Lord in that ye have builded you an altar that ye might rebel this day against the Lord?

“Is the iniquity of Peor too little for us from which we are not cleansed to this day?

“But that ye must turn away this day from following the Lord; and it will be seeing ye rebel to-day against the Lord that to-morrow he will be wroth with the whole congregation of Israel.

“Notwithstanding, if the land of your possession be unclean, then pass ye over into the land of the possession of the Lord wherein the Lord’s Tabernacle dwelleth, and take possession among us, and rebel not against the Lord, and rebel not against us in building you an altar (*bilade*, apart from), beside the altar of the Lord our God.”

Whereof the princes of the children of Israel were thus answered:

“The Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know, if *it be* in rebellion or if in transgression against the Lord, (save us not this day) that we have builded us an altar to turn from following the Lord, or if to offer thereon burnt offering or meat offering; or if to offer peace offerings thereon, let the Lord himself require *it*, and if we have not done it for fear of *this* thing (*dabar*, saying)—

“In time to come your children might speak unto our children, saying, what have ye to do with the Lord God of Israel? . . . therefore, we said let us now prepare to build us an altar, not for burnt offering nor for sacrifice; but that it may be a witness between us and you and our generations after us that

we might do the service of the Lord before Him with our burnt offerings, and with our sacrifices, and with our peace offerings; that your children may not say to our children, in time to come, ye have no part in the Lord.

"Therefore, said we, that it shall be when they should so say to us, or to our generations, in time to come, that we may say again, behold the PATTERN of the altar of the Lord which our fathers made, not for burnt offerings, nor for sacrifices, but it is a witness between us and you. God forbid that we should rebel against the Lord, and turn this day from following the Lord, to build an altar for burnt offerings, for meat offerings or for sacrifices (*beide*, apart from), beside the altar of the Lord our God that is before his Tabernacle. . . .

"And the thing (*dabar*, answer) pleased the children of Israel, and the children of Israel blessed God, and did not (*amar*, speak to go up against them in battle), intend to go up against them in battle, to destroy the land wherein the children of Reuben and Gad dwelt."

From all this, we learn that the priests, the princes, and the congregation of the children of Israel, after they had conquered the land of Canaan, and had established the Tabernacle at Shiloh, as the only sanctuary for all the tribes, were very jealous that no sacrifices should be offered in any other place than at the one sanctuary, as Moses had commanded, on the other side of Jordan.

Thus early after the entry of the children of Israel into the land of Palestine, we have this decisive evidence that it was regarded as a rational sin, for which God would hold all the tribes responsible, if a second sanctuary were set up; and, hence, the clamor for hostilities, against the tribes who were suspected of setting up a sanctuary east of the Jordan; and, yet, the learned Professor in the citations already made, says: "Till then (the reign of Josiah) there were in Judah, as there had been before in Samaria, a multitude of local sanctuaries, the existence of which no one dreamt of disputing."

Moreover, we learn from the 24th chapter of Joshua, that

when Joshua was old, he called together the princes, judges and elders of Israel and recounted briefly the history of Israel from the call of Abraham, their sojourn in Egypt, their bondage, passage of the Red Sea, and residence for a time in the Wilderness, and their wars, and entry into Palestine; and it is added "and Joshua made a covenant with the people on that day, and set them a statute and an ordinance in Shechem, and Joshua wrote these words, in the *book* of the *law* of God; and he took a great stone, and set it up there, under the oak by the *sanctuary* of the Lord, (for a witness of the covenant they had entered into to observe all the ordinances of Moses), and Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who lived many days after Joshua, and who had known all the deeds of the Lord that he had done for Israel."

From this latter statement, the inference is quite irresistible, that during the lifetime of Joshua, and that for forty or fifty years after his death, until the whole generation was spent, which had crossed the Jordan, that the commandment by the hand of Moses, contained in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was strictly observed; namely, worship in one place in one of the tribes which the Lord should choose.

And, yet, the learned Professor tells us, without a blush, as if unconscious of the falsehood, that until the time of Josiah no one thought of disputing the legitimacy of the local sanctuaries; and, by assuming this position he desires it to be inferred, that the commandment of Moses mentioned in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was an invention of a later age; and, that such proof discredits the ordinances of Moses as they are found in the Pentateuch.

Thorough the whole course of the argument, we find this able and ingenious advocate seeking to establish his hypothesis of fraud, not by a dispassionate critical sifting of the evidence, but partly by omitting to notice facts fatal to his hypothesis, and partly, by making deductions not involved in the premises or broader than the facts would warrant, and this is called the "higher criticism," which seems to paralyze multitudes of unstable minds.

The most important question involved in this contention is, the alleged conflict between the paragraph in the 20th chapter of Exodus, relative to the altar, contained in the 24th, 25th and 26th verses, and that part of the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy, contained in the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th verses, relative to worship at one sanctuary only.

The question involved is one of importance and invites our most serious consideration.

The passage in Exodus is found in the chapter containing the ten commandments written on the tables of stone, and is as follows: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in all the places where I record my name, I will come unto thee and I will bless thee."

The paragraph on the same subject which the learned Professor insists is in conflict with the foregoing directions in relation to an altar, is as follows, Deuteronomy 12th chapter, beginning with the 8th verse:

"Ye shall not do after all *the* things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes.

"For ye are not yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you.

"But when ye go over Jordan and dwell on the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit; and when he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety, then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose, to cause his name to dwell there; thither shall ye bring all that I command you; your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, your tithes and the heave offerings of your hand, and all your ~~choice~~ vows, which ye vow unto the Lord, and ye shall appear before the Lord your God, ye and your sons and your daughters and your men servants, and your maid servants, and the ~~levite~~ that is within your gates; forasmuch as he hath no part nor inheritance with you.

"Take heed to thyself, that thou offer not thy burnt offerings

in every place that thou seest; but in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of the tribes, there shalt thou offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all I command thee."

The first observation proper to be made here is, that the ordinance in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was *wholly prospective*.

As a civil regulation, its observance would tend to unify and consolidate the tribes into a homogeneous body, and enable them better to act in concert, offensively and defensively.

As a religious observance it was a forward step, in which the whole nation collectively would acknowledge the reign of God; and, unconsciously, join in celebrating the mystery of the atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God, slain from the foundation of the world.

That the ordinance of worship, mentioned in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy, was well known and in force as early as when Joshua had conquered the land of Canaan, is abundantly established by the indignation which prevailed throughout the whole congregation of Israel, on hearing a report that the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh were about to erect a different altar in the district of the Jordan, from the sanctuary and altar at Shiloh. See the facts as narrated in the 22d chapter of Joshua, from the 10th verse to the end, and in the presence of such facts, how utterly rash and inconsiderate the assertion of Professor Wellhausen, that the book of Deuteronomy was "*not known*" before the priest Hilkiah found it in the house of the Lord, in the reign of King Josiah, hundreds of years after the death of Joshua.

The learned Professor cites the paragraph above referred to in the 20th chapter of Exodus, in proof that the ordinances of worship mentioned in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy were unknown until the time of King Josiah.

I have already refuted this position, by evidence of the most convincing character cotemporaneous with the times of Joshua, and the generation succeeding him, and to sustain his position

based on this citation, the learned Professor, *inter alia*, says: "And Jehovah proposes to come to his worshipers and bless them, not in the place where he causes His name to dwell; but at every such place."

That part of the paragraph referred to in the 20th chapter of Exodus, material to be quoted, reads as follows in our English Bibles, beginning with the 22d verse:

"And the Lord said unto Moses, thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel.

"Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven.

"Ye shall not make with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold.

"An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.

"And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it.

"Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon."

The learned Professor relegates this part of the Pentateuch to what he designates as the Jehovistic history book, while he places Deuteronomy in the "Priestly Code."

He said with much assurance, that the book discovered by Hilkiah when the Temple was being repaired, was the book of Deuteronomy, and quite inconsequently that it was unknown before that time.

So when he came to speak of the restoration of the law, Nehemiah 8th and 9th chapters, he says, page 514:

"It is closely analogous to the narrative of the introduction of the Deuteronomic law, under Josiah in 2d Kings xxii." . . .

So, we are told here, that the *Torah in the rest of the Pentateuch*, became known in 444 and was unknown till that date.

This shows us in the first place, that Deuteronomy contains an earlier stage of the law than the priestly *Torah*; and, fur-

er, as the date of Deuteronomy can be inferred from the date its publication and introduction under Josiah, so, in like manner, the date of the composition of the "Priestly Code" can be inferred from its publication and enforcement by Ezra and Nehemiah.

It is important to note here, that according to Wellhausen, the 20th chapter of Exodus from which I have quoted is a part of the "*Torah* in the rest of the Pentateuch" not known, as he says, till 444 B. C.

And yet, in the course of his argument against the authenticity of the ordinances in Deuteronomy relative to one sanctuary for all the tribes, he quoted this paragraph in the 20th chapter of Exodus as being an older stratum of the law, relative to worship directly in conflict with the law of worship in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy; but now, page 514, says: "That the *Torah* (law) in the rest of the Pentateuch became known in 444 B. C. and was unknown till that date;" although this "*rest of the Torah*" contained the ordinance cited from the 20th chapter of Exodus, and although he cited this very ordinance to convince that the ordinance in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was not only in conflict with the patriarchal mode of worship, but also with this ancient ordinance found in the book of Exodus. The "Higher Criticism" of which Prof. Wellhausen is the most persistent exponent, unwilling to admit the inspired character of the Pentateuch, and unable to account for its historical facts on rational grounds, originated the hypothesis that the books of Moses were inventions of a later date, dressed in the drapery of antiquity, and without any inspired or even historical value. After careful consideration I find no conflict between the law paragraph in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, and the ordinances relative to worship in the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy.

The sacrificial altar of the Old Testament saints, after their exodus from Egypt, consisted of the foundation, and of the portable superstructure designed to rest upon the foundation, and both were called, *Mizbeach*.

At the time that the ordinances of worship were promulgated at Horeb, the Jews had many years of wandering before them in the desert of Sinai, before they could, according to the divine appointment, reach the promised land of Palestine; and, as they journeyed from place to place, many altar foundations would have to be raised by the people, to support the portable superstructure of the altar described in the 27th chapter of Exodus, from the 1st to the 8th verse, both inclusive.

It is evident that this portable superstructure was intended to cover and rest on the foundation of earth or stone.

The superstructure was exclusively in charge of the priests, and was costly and durable; while the foundations of the altar were to be prepared by the people, and were to be plain earth or stone and inexpensive.

Hence Moses was directed to say to the children of Israel, "An altar of earth thou shalt make to me."

The last paragraph in the 20th chapter of Exodus and the first eight verses in the 27th chapter are in *pari materia* contemporaneous in date, and according to the rule adopted in all the courts in civilized countries, must be construed together, and such construction fits in with the direction contained in the 7th and 8th verses of the 27th chapter of Exodus.

"And the staves shall be put into the rings, and the staves shall be upon the two sides of the altar, to bear it.

"Hollow with boards shalt thou make it as it was shewed thee in the mount, so shall they make it."

This portable altar, we may infer, was made hollow, so that it could be fitted over the foundations of earth or stone, which the labor of the people would prepare, at every point where the Tabernacle was set up.

And as we have no evidence that worship was offered at any other place than at the Tabernacle after it was completed and set up at each resting place in the journeyings of the Israelites through the Wilderness; a strong moral probability arises that from the time the Tabernacle was set up, there was but one sanctuary and one altar at which religious worship was offered,

although many altar-foundations were erected during the travel and sojourn in the Wilderness, and until the Tabernacle finally rested in Palestine at Shiloh; and from what has been already shown, sacrificial worship was confined to this one sanctuary and altar, until the last of the Hebrews had passed away, who crossed the Jordan with Joshua.

Nor can I accept the construction the learned Professor has put on the last clause of the 24th verse of the 20th chapter of Exodus.

After directing an altar, not altars, of earth to be erected for burnt-offerings and for peace-offerings, the text proceeds, "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee."

Jehovah reserves the coming and the blessing to places where He may record His name.

Nor could the learned Professor make any thing for his construction, by appealing to the Hebrew text, for there "*maquom*," place, is in the singular and the Hebrew definite article is attached to it.

The most definite description of the pattern of the Tabernacle was furnished to Moses on the holy mountain, with all its measurements, lineal and cubic, and also of all the figures and emblems which were to adorn it, and all its vessels, curtains and appointments, and the relative size of the Holy Place, and of the Holy of Holies.

On comparing these measurements with the dimensions, lineal and cubic, of Solomon's Temple, which was begun to be erected 1012 years B. C. 1st Kings, 6th chapter; 2d Chron., 3d chapter, we find that the arrangements are identical and the dimensions of every part of which we have any definite description, are exactly double.

Thus the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle was ten cubits each way; in the Temple twenty cubits each way. In the Tabernacle the Holy place was ten cubits high, ten cubits wide and twenty cubits long.

In the Temple all these dimensions were exactly double.

In the Tabernacle, the Porch was the width of the east end

of the Tabernacle, and in the Temple the width of the eastern end of the Temple, and was five cubits deep in the Tabernacle, and ten in the Temple.

The ground plan of the Temple was eighty cubits by forty; that of the Tabernacle was forty by twenty.

The walls of the Tabernacle were ten cubits high, and those of the Temple twenty cubits, and the whole height of the Tabernacle was fifteen cubits, and that of the Temple thirty cubits, the roof of the one rising five cubits above the height of the internal wall, and that of the other ten cubits.

The dimensions of the second Temple or Temple of Zerubbabel, about 520 years B. C., Book of Ezra, 6 and 3, was not in accordance with the dimensions of the Tabernacle or of the Temple of Solomon; but the sanctuary of the Temple of Solomon was precisely on the plan of the Sanctuary of the Tabernacle, only in this, that the dimensions of the Sanctuary of the first Temple were exactly double the dimensions of the Sanctuary of the Tabernacle, in many particulars; so that beyond all question both were copies of one plan; and the only plan of which we have any historical knowledge is the plan communicated to Moses at Sinai, and which he was commanded to observe in the construction of the Tabernacle.

Again, if the Babylonian Priests, as Professor Wellhausen argues, had invented the description of the Tabernacle and its furniture, and the dress and ornaments of the High Priest, described in the 20th chapter of Exodus and 12th chapter of Deuteronomy, then the invented Tabernacle would have been made to conform in all its dimensions and appointments with the second Temple or Temple of Zerubbabel constructed under the direction of these Babylonian Priests, or some even sub-multiple of such dimensions, and yet, we find that such a regulation was not observed.

It is not more than barely necessary here, to mention that the learned Professor and his confederates of the Higher Criticism, seek to establish the most stupendous fraud on the part of the Babylonian Priests, who were held in the highest estimation

by the greatest and most enlightened Kings of Persia—Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes.

The kingdom of Israel was rent asunder, 975 years B. C., and 476 years after the entry of the Jews into Palestine.

The ten seceding tribes established their capital at Samaria, Hebrew Shomeron, in the territory originally belonging to the tribe of Joseph.

The northern kingdom, after the separation, continued to flourish with varied fortunes for more than two hundred and fifty years, or to 721 B. C., when the capital was taken, and many of them carried into captivity by Salmanasar, the King of Assyria.

It would be quite incredible to believe that on the separation they did not take with them one or more copies of the Pentateuch as it then existed in 975 B. C.

Sixteen manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch have been discovered, written in the old *Ibri* or Samaritan characters, and these copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch do not differ materially from the Hebrew Pentateuch as it has reached us, except that Mount Gerizim is indicated, instead of Mount Ebal, as the place where certain lustrations were commanded to be observed by the children of Israel, after their entry into the land of Canaan; and some few other minor differences.

Some of these manuscripts were discovered long before the present phase of contention was mooted, and are evidence of a very high character of the great antiquity of the Pentateuch; and yet the learned Professor neither notices nor combats the effect of such evidence.

The entire absence of later Aramaic and Chaldaic from the Pentateuch, except in the single instance of the covenant between Laban, the Syrian, and Jacob his son-in-law, also remain unnoticed.

The reasoning by which the learned author reaches the conclusion that the Pentateuch is composed of three distinct parts, namely, Deuteronomy, the Priestly Code, and the Jehovist, is quite as inconsequential as his deductions concerning the date

of Deuteronomy and the rest of the *Torah*, and need not be discussed, except to say that a synthesis based on such a division would be impossible.

It must be admitted that Prof. Wellhausen is a man of ability and of undoubted learning.

His article on the Pentateuch, as well as his *Geschichte der Israels*, illuminate or dishonor the pages of the ninth edition of the British Encyclopædia, and he is regarded as the ablest exponent of the "Higher Criticism."

How then shall we explain the many rash and unwarranted conclusions drawn by him without adequate evidence to support them, and often against contrary presumptions and irresistible historical facts, that the "Priestly Code" did not originate in and after the exile?

Even Kuenen, a collaborateur with the learned Professor, observes "that it is absolutely necessary to start with the plain and unambiguous facts, and to allow them to guide our judgment on questionable points." . . . "We must," he says, "first gain a general view of the whole field, instead of always working away at details, and then coming out with a rounded theory which lacks nothing but a foundation."

Dr. Thomas Brown, a metaphysician of some distinction of the last century, in discussing "cause and effect" attaches special importance to the influence of "oft-recurrent volitions" which resolve "into permanent and prevailing desires consequent upon deliberation."

In view of Professor Wellhausen's broad deductions from inadequate data must we not conclude that the learned Professor, having deliberated long over this subject, his permanent and prevailing desire to establish a favorite hypothesis, has so obscured his ability to weigh evidence—"That trifles light as air are (to him only) confirmations strong as proofs of Holy Writ."

Certainly, on no rational principle can the deductions of the learned Professor, based on the data before him, be made to coincide with a cool, dispassionate and calm judgment based on the same facts.

Neither Jew nor Christian can have any quarrel with the learned Professor and his coadjutors in the field of the "Higher Criticism;" they are but scavengers in the temple of science and philology, to make more manifest to this age of activity, enterprise, invention and research, the invulnerable character of the proof on which the Pentateuch rests.

Professor Wellhausen has added his own great ability and scholarship to the labors of his coadjutors for the last thirty years in the same field, and has embodied the results of their united assaults on the Pentateuch, in the article I am considering, and yet how feebly they strike, a mere pin scratch on the rock of Gibraltar.

There could have been no Moses and Aaron without a Pharaoh, and this iron age of merely intellectual judgments might have lost faith in the foundation of the Christian religion, if the great thinking force of Germany had not led and persisted in the assault which even in the judgment of one of the most judicious of the co-laborateurs in the same field, A. Kuenen, Professor at Leyden, has ended in a "rounded theory without a foundation."

The Aaronic cultus established by Moses in the Wilderness was continued after the entry of the Hebrews into Palestine, at the Tabernacle in Shiloh during the lifetime of Joshua, and after his death, as we have already seen, until all the generation was spent which crossed the Jordan.

This cultus consisted of a number of attendant particulars, the Tabernacle constructed according to the *tabnith* pattern shown to Moses in the Holy Mountain, the specific dimensions of the Tabernacle, the Ark of the Covenant, the Mercy Seat, the shew bread and the cherubim, the vestments and ornaments to be worn by the High Priest, the breast plate, the mitre with the inscription, "Holy unto the Lord," the ephod and the "Urim and Thummin," all as described in the 25th chap. to the 32d chap. of Exodus; and after this sanctuary was constructed it was, so far as the evidence shows, the only place of worship in the camp of the congregation of Israel, and the whole of the

religious cultus was observed at this one sanctuary, as commanded in the chapter of Exodus above referred to, even before the entry of the Israelites into Palestine, although the Lord, as we have already seen, only commanded by the hand of Moses, that the tribes after entering Palestine should worship at the sanctuary at one place, which the Lord should choose, and, in obedience to this command, Joshua established the Tabernacle at Shiloh, where the tribes all worshipped until the generation which passed over the Jordan with Joshua were spent.

The lapse after this period was at first gradual and went on increasing until the Ark of the Covenant was captured by the Philistines at the great battle of Aphek, in 1055 B. C., after which period the worship of Jehovah was divided between the shrines of Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah, and Gibeon; but we have no evidence that any of the other ordinances of worship by the divine command which Moses had ordained in the Wilderness were not observed, so far as it was possible to do so, in the absence of a fixed Tabernacle or sanctuary of worship; even then, if the learned Professor had made out his point, (which he has not) that the religious cultus in Palestine, from the date of the entry of the Israelites into the promised land, was divided between several shrines and not confined to one place, this would be quite inconsequential.

The ceremonial worship under the Jewish dispensation in conformity to the ordinances mentioned in the 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th chapters of Deuteronomy, must have been of unsurpassed solemnity and grandeur.

It would be hardly possible, even in this age of invention, art and taste, to reproduce a religious ceremonial more solemn, sublime, impressive and artistic than the worship at the Tabernacle prescribed in the chapter of Deuteronomy referred to.

It consisted of many particulars, the altar of incense and of burnt offerings, the Tabernacle with its peculiar dimensions, coverings and furniture; the Pontifical robes, vestments and ornaments of the High Priest, rivaling in minute splendor all the

colors of the bow of promise ; and the injunction requiring this ceremonial worship to be observed at one sanctuary which the Lord should choose after the entry of the tribes into Palestine.

The learned Professor insists that the Jews, at all times, until after the Exile, worshiped at many shrines, and that it never occurred to any one that this worship at a plurality of shrines was in violation of the injunction recorded in the Book of Deuteronomy to worship at one sanctuary ; and hence, the learned Professor draws the sweeping conclusion that all we read about the religious ceremonial in Deuteronomy was an invention of the Babylonian Priests after the exile, that is to say, in 444, B.C.

I have already shown that the assumption of Professor Wellhausen that the Jews at all times prior to the Exile worshiped at many shrines is a grave error, and is contradicted by the evidence ; but if it were true, the failure of the Jews to observe one of the ordinances mentioned in Deuteronomy where that ordinance was a component part of a series of ordinances relative to worship, would not warrant the conclusion that the ordinances mentioned in Deuteronomy were the invention of a subsequent age ; when it can be shown that many of the provisions of these ordinances were observed from the entry of the Jews into Palestine down to the time of the Exile and afterwards.

If it be a fact that the Latin church, for more than six hundred years has ceased to distribute to the laity wine in the celebration of the Holy Communion, such fact would not warrant the conclusion that our Lord did not institute the Last Supper, as narrated in the Gospel.

One of the most striking features of worship mentioned in Deuteronomy, was the *Urim* and *Thummim* in the breast-plate of the High Priest.

During the reign of Saul, the first king of Israel, when the disastrous battle of Gilboa was imminent (1st Samuel, 28th chapter, 6th verse), we read : "And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by *Urim*, nor by prophets."

The *Urim* was the oracle of judgment in the breast-plate of the High Priest, and never existed separate from it, and the breast-plate and its form and ornaments were component parts of the series of ordinances of worship ordained in the Wilderness at Horeb.

In 1st Samuel, 21st chapter, 9th verse, the Ephod in which the breast-plate was set, is incidentally mentioned as in the possession of Ahimelech, the High Priest at Nob, and also the shew bread.

This was after the loss of the Ark of the Covenant, which was captured by the Philistines at the battle of Aphek. In 2d Chron., 18th chapter, 11th verse, the shew bread and golden candlesticks are mentioned, 955 B. C.

Joshua, 18th chapter, 1st verse, the Tabernacle was set up at Shiloh and some time after the loss of the Ark of the Covenant, it was removed to Gibeon, where it remained until the Temple of Solomon was built on a larger scale, but of the same pattern.

These surviving relics prescribed in the ordinances of worship ordered at Horeb, which were still in existence hundreds of years after the Jews entered Palestine and several hundred years before the exile, conclusively establish the fact that the body of ordinances, of which they formed a part, were not the invention of a later age, as contended for by Prof. Wellhausen.

Fraud is never presumed, but must be proved by those who make the charge.

In view of what has been said in opposition to the contention of Wellhausen, it follows that the Professor has not made out even a suspicion of fraud.

If the inspiration of the Pentateuch and the miracles therein recorded were out of the question, the problem which confronts us would not be solved.

How were three millions, or even half that number, of lately liberated bondmen and their flocks and herds fed, watered and clothed for a period of forty years in an arid desert, deficient in water, game and pasturage?

How was it possible that the son-in-law of the Midian priest who had been absent from Egypt for forty years could prevail upon the ruler of Egypt to let his most useful laborers leave the country under the pretext of sacrificing the ram and the bull, animals, which the Egyptians held sacred and worshiped. Exodus, 8th chapter, 26th verse: "And Pharaoh called for Moses and for Aaron and said, Go ye sacrifice to your God in the land."

Moses answered: "Would not Egyptians stone us, if we sacrificed the abomination, *tolbah*, of the Egyptians before their eyes?"

Moses, if uninspired as an historian, ruler, judge and law-giver, combined in his one personality a measure of human greatness far transcending that of any other man who has ever lived.

How is this to be accounted for? His laws, his statutes and his ordinances have formed the fundamental basis of the moral code and legislation which have governed and controlled the actions and lives of more human beings than now exist on the face of the globe.

The fall of Moses from the position of a divinely inspired lawgiver would shake the whole fabric of the Christian world, from centre to circumference.

The honored guest of the transfiguration on Mount Tabor, could not be dragged down from the exalted position ascribed to him for four thousand years, without involving the Gospel in his fall.

Superficial Christians regard the "Higher Criticism" with a feeling akin to fear; subjected to a rigorous scrutiny its spectral pretensions vanish like the mists of the morning.

NOTE—The word "the" in the sentence "not in *the* place, but in every such place," is italicized by Wellhausen; all other English sentences italicized by the reviewer.

APPENDIX *

Prof. Greenleaf is the author of a treatise on the law of evidence which is quoted in all the courts of the United States as authority. The following rules of evidence are extracted from his treatise on the credibility of the Gospel, and are equally applicable in this investigation.

"Every document, apparently ancient, coming from the proper repository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine, and devolves on the opposing party the burden of proving it to be otherwise.—*Greenleaf*."

"That the Books of the Old Testament, as we now have them, are genuine; that they existed in the time of our Saviour, and were commonly received and referred to among the Jews, as the same books of their religion, etc., are facts which we are entitled to assume as law, until the contrary is shown.—*Ibid*."

"These copies of the Holy Scriptures having been in familiar use in the churches from the time when the text was committed to writing . . . and having in all ages down to this day been respected as the authoritative source of all ecclesiastical power and government, and . . . acted under in regard to so many claims of right, on the one hand, and so many obligations of duty on the other. . . . It is for the objector to show them spurious; for on him, by the plainest rules of law, lies the burden of proof."—*Ibid*."

V.

CHRIST'S HEADSHIP AND SONSHIP.

BY THE LATE REV. S. H. GIESY, D.D.

UNIVERSAL allegiance and homage follow, by natural order of statement, and by necessary and inevitable consequence, Christ's essential and eternal Sonship. Fealty and sovereignty, belong to each other by inward necessity and not by mere outward arrangement and rule. To obey is the duty of the subject, to command the right of the sovereign. "Honor the King," whatever the outward form of government, is a precept grounded in the original divine constitution of society, and not in prudential consideration simply of the maintenance of good order and the peace, prosperity and happiness of mankind.

Being the "Only Son of God," of one self-existent nature with the Father, the authority of the Highest is His, the readiest subjection ours. Two words in the Creed stand for due and loving service on our part, for rightful sovereignty on His. The words, OUR LORD, express these two tremendous and potent facts: Christ's universal Headship and Rulership.

"Our" expresses the stubborn fact of a community of nature and need—a common ruin in Adam, a common redemption in Christ. In this broad, comprehensive sense it is used in the Lord's Prayer, on every one's tongue the world over. There it sounds the note of the universal Fatherhood of God, while here it is the glad note of the universal Saviourhood of Christ. Maurice is right in finding in its very first word the greatest difficulty in the ordinary and common use of this prayer. "How can we," he says, "look around upon the people whom we habitually feel to be separated from us by almost impassable

barriers ; who are above us so that we cannot reach them, or so far beneath us, that the slightest recognition of them is an act of gracious condescension ; upon the people of an opposite faction to our own, whom we denounce as utterly evil ; upon men whom we have reason to despise ; upon the actual wrong-doers of society, those who have made themselves vile, and are helping to make it vile—and then teach ourselves to think that in the very highest exercise of our lives these are associated with us ; that when we pray we are praying for them and with them ; that we cannot speak for ourselves without speaking for them ; that if we do not carry their sins to the throne of God's grace, we do not carry our own ; that all the good we hope to obtain there, belongs to them just as much as to us, and that our claim to it is sure of being rejected, if it is not one which is valid for them also ? Yet all this is included in the word 'Our : ' till we have learnt so much, we are but spelling at it."

There is everywhere the "baser sort" of men—sunk in sin and shameless with it all—but there is with them no monopoly of sin. "Sinners above all men" they may be, but not sinners alone. We be children of a common father, the offspring of a common root. And as in the Lord's Prayer "Our Father's" ear is alike open to every cry—so in the Creed just as little room can there be for any thought of meter and bounds to Divine mercy, any class-distinctions, any so-called "limited atonement." Far nearer the truth is this answer in the Church Catechism, when to the question, "What dost thou chiefly learn in these articles of thy Belief?" it says with directness on this point, "I learn to believe in God the Son who hath redeemed me, and all *mankind*." And hence, here is, not my Lord, nor your Lord, not this nor that man's Lord alone, but OUR LORD—broad and boundless comprehension ! no class-proprietorship of any sort, whether by reason of Divine selection, or human birth and rank on the one side, or low and abject state on the other, but "all sorts and conditions of men," the humblest slave and the princeliest master equally needing and equally sharing in the redemptive virtue and power of this

one Lord of the race. "And there," a writer thus strongly puts it, "the queen upon her throne, or the nobles in her court, can have no larger share in, no nearer interest in, or access to Christ our Lord than the meanest beggar in our streets, or pauper in our workhouses. No one has a greater share in Him than another, because that humanity of which He is the Head is not a thing that admits of degrees, it is the common attribute of all, and none can monopolize a larger share of it than another."

Mankind is one family. The broad diversities so well known seem to be in utter contradiction of this idea of the unity of the race. Not a few eminent naturalists affirm that the cranial and facial, the physiological as well as the physiognomical differences, shape of head, size of brain, color of skin, texture of hair, are so marked and great as to be hopelessly irreconcilable with the theory of derivation from a single primal pair. Others of equal distinction assert that these varied types are traceable to the action, through the lapse of ages, of climatic and social influences. The question is too broad for discussion here. On our part we accept heartily the Scriptural narrative of the origin of man, running back to his Eden home, his original innocence, and its loss in Adam's failure.

But the moral diversity is no less marked and unmistakable than the physical; and yet no man thinks of denying the moral and spiritual unity of the race. The idea of God, the prevalence of action looking to the approbation of some higher Being, the presence and operation of conscience, some belief, shadow or otherwise, in an after state conditioned on life and conduct here, the universal sense of sin and misery thereby—these moral concepts belong to all races, descending from generation to generation like great heirlooms. The same moral taint flows through all veins. There are in the human heart abysses of evil which we have no line and plummet to sound. Whatever the complexion of the skin, or the set of the eyes, or the twist of the hair, it is all the same—there lie imbedded there the possibilities of a Judas or a John, of an infamous Nero or a holy

Paul, of an unscrupulous Quilp or a saintly Bunyan—One heart beats in every breast: said a prophet, “deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” This deep all-pervading consciousness of sinful capabilities, more astounding in some cases than in others, but alarming in all, makes all akin—every man a brother to every other man, all alike sinners, and all alike needing the one Saviour of mankind.

In Christ mankind stand under a second Head, and in a second probation. With graphic pen, with wonderful compass and force, St. Paul expresses in a single word His inclusive relation to our fallen race. He styles Him, “the second Adam,” and so makes His redemptive work and merit to run parallel with the ruin effected by the first and fallen Adam. The misfortunes of the first have traveled down the ages, kept pace with the spread of the race, cut deep channels in the world's history for human blood to course through; and as well must the untold benefits of the Second recur to the ultimate generation of man. It is then, with the profoundest meaning, as with the widest effect of His saving power, that the apostle uses this appellation. In the first Adam, the race came to a common overthrow, and that under the least unfavorable circumstances of probation; in the Second, under circumstances the most adverse, it was brought to a successful probation and universal deliverance. Round these two representative men the whole history of mankind turns, first on the side of sin and death in the natural head, then on the side of salvation and life in the second and supernatural. The thought will recur again.

Headship and rulership are clearly one in this case for its own saving ends. Christ is our LORD. This was primarily title of respect and honor,—the way inferiors spoke to or superiors. The word carries along the idea of power or authority over others, but always as moderated and restrained by moral limitations. Among the Greeks a man in respect to his slaves was *δεσποτης*, but in respect to his wife and children *κυριος*, the natural relation softening and toning down the

use of authority, "even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him *lord*" (1 Peter 3: 6).

As a title of proper deference and respect, the word passed to the original Greek of the New Testament, as servants to masters (St. Matt. 13: 27); as sons to father (16: 30); and as due from all to men in authority (27: 63); also from strangers to strangers, as when the Greeks spake to Philip, saying: "Sir (*κύριε*), we would see Jesus (St. John 12: 21); and as when Nicodemus, taking the risen Christ to be the gardener only," said: "Sir (*κύριε*), if thou have borne Him hence" (20: 15). Thus as a dignified and decorous way of addressing another, it is the equivalent simply of our English, Sir. And on several occasions where the title is applied to Christ Himself, it is not to be denied that it is used in no higher and other sense than this, as when the Samaritaness at the well of Sychar addressed Him as a common Jew: "Sir (*κύριε*), thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep" (St. John 4: 11, 15, 19); as when the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, not knowing who had cured him, said: "Sir (*κύριε*), I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool" (5: 7).

But such current use of the word, proper enough under all circumstances of outward deference and respect, is of secondary and derivative, not primary signification and force. Even each secondary use is not purely accidental, but, as just intimated, rests itself on facts which run back to the very beginning of human relations and language. Human authority is itself, as human relations, but the shadow of the higher, the divine. The idea of dominion, power is inherent in the word itself.

Traced back to its ultimate root, whether under Hebrew, Greek, Latin or English form, it is found to be derived from a word signifying *to judge, to command, to direct, to rule*, and even as indicating in an imperious and arrogant manner its use sometimes, *to domineer*. Hence Adon, *κύριος*, dominus, Lord, and Adonai, the LORD. In early Scripture, as conceding is right in this respect, Sarah called her husband "lord"

John 1: 1-3; so *Septuagint*, also 1 Peter 3: 6); so *Hebrew* *Adonai*: *my* *lord*, *my* *master*, *my* *father* *Lord* (31: 35); so *Pharaoh* is named the "lord" of Joseph, whom he had bought 30: 23; and in *Genesis* 18: 12, as the Egyptian court, to whom they made *official* *reference*, was thus named by his *name* 18: 10. These various instances show that the word expressed the position of power on the human side; as husband, master, ruler, and superior prince.

In our English Bible this word properly enough stands for the Hebrew *Adonai*. Profound reverence for this sacred name of God inspired the Jews pronouncing it, and *Adonai*, the *Lord*, became the common substitute. In the *Septuagint* version *kyrios* is the Greek equivalent for *Jehovah*, as *Dominus* is in the *Vulgate*. *Adonai* was employed rather in a generic sense, as *kyrios* among the Greeks, and *Deus* among the Latins; while *Jehovah* was regarded as the strictly personal and proper name of God, and hence breathed rather than spoken. The translators of the *Septuagint* were not careful to observe this distinction, indiscriminately using *kyrios*, *Lord*, as expressive of *Deity*, and as answering as well to the proper name of God as His title by absolute and exclusive right as the One, All-powerful Ruler. This sense of direct personal and indisputable authority is beautifully preserved by the *Psalter* in its translation of the 5th Psalm: "O *Lord*, our Governor, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world!" Thus, under its old Hebrew form, and as clearly under the corresponding Greek, Latin and English, the title *Lord* stands for Self-existent and Self-sufficient Being, the absolute Source of all things, "the living God" (Psalm 42: 2).

And where the title is applied by the New Testament writers to Christ in direct reference to His unique character, it makes His co-equality with the Father, His Eternal Sonship, and by virtue of that His singular and exclusive property, His rightful claim on man's allegiance, homage, worship, obedient and affectionate service. As expressive of this real Jehovistic force

d meaning of the name, and His own essential right to the name, they habitually speak of Him, not as a Lord—one among a thousand others—but definitely and emphatically, as “*the LORD*.” Says St. Paul, “*the LORD of glory*” (τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης, 1 Cor. 11: 8); “*the Lord from heaven*” (ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, 15: 47); and St. John, with marvellous emphasis, “*KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS*” (Revelation 19: 16). “*Come see the place where the LORD lay*” (ὁ κύριος, St. Matt. 27: 6). “*The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto men*” (St. Luke 24: 34). “*They have taken away the LORD from the sepulchre*” (τὸν κύριον, St. John 20: 2). “*I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto thee*” (τὸ τῶν κύριον, 1 Cor. 11: 23). In no mind did the fact of Christ’s resurrection encounter such stubborn unbelief as in the case of St. Thomas. The testimony of ten men, as honest and competent as himself, who positively affirmed to him, is not believed by him, and he stoutly claims for himself the opportunity of proof which had been vouchsafed them, for the want of which a whole week is spent in dejection and gloom. And when what he so persistently demands at length comes, even with a merited rebuke, sweeping away the night of his soul, there springs to his lips this irresistible conviction: “*My LORD and my God*” (St. John 20: 28). Thus, the Gospel was opened. Undoubtedly, in this absolute and specific sense, the angelic announcement to a yearning world, first sounded in the ears of Bethlehem’s dazed and hardly half-conscious shepherds, is to be taken: “*For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is CHRIST THE LORD*” (St. Luke 2: 11).

It is, then, in His mysterious nature—heaven’s eternal Prince enough in earthly guise, the “*Son of the Highest*” (St. Luke 1: 32), yet the Son of the lowliest, the Virgin-born, and yet, a comprehensible fact! “*God of God*”—it is in this oneness of essence and existence with God, where we do and must find the deepest ground for the exclusive appropriation of this title. And, thus, because in His unique person the redemptive Head

of universal humanity. He is the true and proper Lord, in whose name and by whose merits alone our prayers go up to the one God and Father of us all. — "Through Jesus Christ our Lord;" — "through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," thus it is that Collect after Collect is brought to an end.

How inferior then upon the basis of absolute Sonship by essential Divinity is this well-nigh invariable language to be defended, and itself released from the charge of mere pious sentiment or unmitigated blasphemy? In the mutilated Prayer Book of King's Chapel, Boston, originally Episcopal, but perverted to Unitarian use and service, the usual formula still stands while the Divine personality lying back of it is repudiated. It is worse than useless awe, unblushing mockery, bold effrontery to go to God in this way, and as with a lie in our mouth, if there be no adequate and absolute Reality back of the Name itself and the current phrase. If He be not all and what He claimed, all and what the New Testament writers are ever claiming for Him, we have no business to be thus always dragging in His name to give efficacy to prayer and access to the Almighty Throne.

But it is by no means a mere empty title. Earth groans under the bondage of a usurping lord. Wearing his coronet of sin, Satan early appears in history a marplot, the restless and unresting spirit of mischief, suggesting evil, arresting good, confusing the sober sense of right and wrong, making the worse appear the better course, darkening the reason, perverting the will, defiling the soul, and turning the life of man from its true polarity and path, to close in Pandemonium the sorry work of undoing begun in Paradise. Goethe gives in his *Faust* an admirable and accurate conception of this destructive character when he puts in the mouth of his Mephistopheles this bold self-proclamation : "I am the spirit who evermore denies." Negation, confusion, destruction, mischief in the higher realm of being has been his remorseless and unremitting work from the very advent of man.

It is a common and smart thing to proclaim disbelief in the

sonal existence of Satan. This comes, partly, from the disinclination to credit any spiritual order of beings, good or bad, God or Devil, and, partly, from the absurd and plentiful caricatures which across the centuries have been thus associated in human thought by profound art. If for political ends it is a man's purpose to bring odium and contempt upon the most prominent characters in a nation's view, he finds no more effective means than the horrid cartoon. Debased art has been widely ranging in this regard, turning the whole serious affair into ridicule and contempt. But through all this sorry travesty the truth cannot be put aside, that the burlesque to be itself an effective thing must rest in a dire reality. Falsehood is truth inverted or exaggerated. Proximity to truth alone gives it effectiveness and currency. The lie which has not a grain of truth at the bottom carries a corrective on its face. Where there has been no infamy or fault of character the political cartoon is without point or power. And so that headship of evil which comes to the front in the opening chapter of human life in history finds confirmation rather in the caricatures which fancy has perpetrated, and is ever parading before the

Another says with force, "unless much of God's word is meaningless enigma, there is a subtle spirit of vast power who fell through pride and transgression from a higher estate, whom God has not annihilated, and whom for infinitely wise purposes, He permits to live, and by way of discipline to try the spirits of men. Uniformly it represents the antagonism of evil to good under such concrete form—a malignant personality called in Hebrew, Satan, Abaddon, in Greek Apollyon, ὁ διάβολος, from which comes the English term devil. Satan is *the evil one*, not merely the principle of evil, "but the evil principle itself in person—ὁ πονηρός. Gesenius, the Hebrew lexicographer, is sufficient authority for the statement, that "with the article הַ the adversary κατ' ἐξοχήν, it assumes the nature of a proper name, i. e. *Satan*, ὁ διάβολος, *the Devil*, the evil spirit who seduces men to evil." The occasion of man's fall was no

original perversity in him to evil, no perverse disposition overpowering good. The first incitement to sin, it is clear enough, came from without—the work of the Biblical account goes for anything, of a Titanic power outside of and distinct from man. “The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat,” is the first bitter confession from sinning lips. The evil passes down with our complete nature. Every soul comes into the world under the stain of sin.

Every kingdom has its headship. In holy Scripture, the kingdom of darkness is conceived of as a vast infernal hierarchy, with its arch-ruler variously called, “the prince of devils,” (*ἀρχὴ τοῦ δαιμονίου*, St. Matthew 12: 24), “the prince of this world,” (*ὁ ἀρχὸν τῆς κόσμου*, St. John 12: 31, 14: 30, 16: 11), “the god of this world,” (*ὁ θεὸς τῶν αἰώνων τούτου*, 2 Corinthians 4: 4), indicating the personality of this evil spirit beside the sphere mainly of his evil operations; “the ruler of darkness,” and “the power of death,” indicating the universal domination of sin and death to be his infernal and inveterate purpose; “principalities and powers,” indicating the diversity and multiplicity of the diabolic agencies under his authority and direction.

The reversal of this hostile order follows. Eternal purity and love will not brook the usurpation. The works of the devil must be destroyed (1 John 3: 8.) This was the Divine purpose, as it appears, from the beginning. How effected? Not by omnipotently annihilating the prince of darkness, but sending to the earth from the very courts of heaven the Prince of Life, and establishing a counter Kingdom of light and truth, righteousness and holy obedience.

As by the rebellion of his will the integrity of man's nature was ruined, so only in the submission of his will to God's in a truly representative and real life is its restoration at all possible.

Hence the advent of the Son of God in the flesh and the work of the second Adam; conflict with hellish powers and victory at every point; man's common life of temptation and the

non life of entire sinlessness and perfect obedience; and at last on the cross with signal triumph over the grave, a noble return to the heaven whence He came. "Thou art King of glory O Christ." No title more dearly earned. No more completely and absolutely His: "Our LORD." "To do this Christ both died and rose again, that He might be LORD of the dead and of the living" (Romans 14: 9).

great powers cross swords over the very cradle of humanity again over the rude manger of Bethlehem, humanity's birth. The seeming utter defeat of good in the collapse of moral nature is followed, in due course, in the effectual triumph of good, in a successful probation under a new Head-leader, and Lord, not weak and frail as the first, but firm and unchangeless under strongest temptation and severest trial, saving Himself; "Stronger than the strong man armed."

as at infinite cost, by bloody conquest, this great deliverance effected. "We are not our own, we are bought with a price" (1 Corinthians 6: 19, 20); "with body and soul, both in life and death, we belong unto our faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, with His precious blood, has fully satisfied for all our sins, delivered us from all the power of the devil."

This glorious achievement in Christ is of truly perennial character and force, embracing all nations, sweeping all ages. It never to fail of this wide and gracious end. Hence, the mission which originally stood in His person is not allotted out into a spiritual abstraction, a vague and vapory idea, a pious thought and sentiment, but under His own hand, in definite and concrete reality. The Church is established and constituted the sole organ and medium of grace and salvation onward to the millennial Kingdom and glory—not by accident, a pious device simply, as some would have it, but itself of the very essence of Christianity. As a spiritual organization for spiritual and eternal ends, the Kingdom of Christ, with its historic ministry, its ecumenical Creeds, its hallowed order, its sacramental channels, all its saving powers, sustains us to-day still as much as it ever did when apostolic

men went up and down the world "disciplining" the nations. "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church" makes a constituent element of Christianity and therefore of the Creed.

Redeemed generically, men are to be *saved* individually. Right at the door of the Church a man meets the Baptismal font, the signal though silent reminder of the necessity of that initial Sacrament. Natural birth is a birth in sin. Every soul comes into the world under its taint. Early, by its representatives and sponsors, the Church takes the child born in sin, and by a solemn sacramental transaction and covenant, transfers it from the Kingdom of nature and sin to the Kingdom of grace. It is a most significant and real act. Nor, as the child is signed with the sign of the cross, does the Church hesitate to pronounce it the child's new birth, and call for thanks for its actual adoption into the family of God.

The act marks not the happy end but the awful and sublime beginning of the individual struggle against the worst side of our nature,—in-born propensities to, and all the outward forces of evil: commits us, as Christ's faithful soldiers and servants, to a manful fight under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil.

"One is our Master." "No man," He does Himself tell us, "can serve two lords; for either he will hate the one and love the other: or else he will hold to the one and despise the other."

Thus follows: in the profoundest sense of the word, to make Christ OUR LORD to enthrone in the very centre and core of our being the powers of good for which He stands in the world; to surrender our will to God's will, even as did He, according to this sublime word: "I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of Him that sent me" (St. John 6: 38); to make His life the law and pattern of our own, and in some sort, a like noble and ennobling thing.

Confessing His absolute property in us, be it our aim that "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord," (Romans 14: 8.). Asked what he should

do if Christ came into the room, Charles Lamb made reply :
“ I should of course fall down on my knees.” Good ! But **loy-**
alty to that Name means a great deal more than any mere out-
ward acts of reverence, and devotion, means a life at every point
brought into free and sweet accord with the pure and holy life
of the **MASTER**, evermore showing forth His praise.

“ Hail Him, the Heir of David's line,
Whom David, Lord did call ;
The God incarnate ! Man divine !
And crown Him Lord of all ! ”

VI.

THE MYSTERY OF EVIL IN THE NATURAL WORLD.

BY REV. SAMUEL Z. BEAM, D.D.

It is not proposed, in the following inquiry, to solve an inexplicable riddle. That is a task which may be left for the ingenuity of the curious. Metaphysicians and scientists may rack their brains in the hitherto futile attempt to discover the metaphysical origin of evil, if they choose. To the writer it appears a useless and vain endeavor to disclose a secret which has so far eluded the search of human ken.

Viewing the question from the Christian standpoint, however, it may be said that moral and physical evil must be traced to sin as its source. Sin has its origin in the self-determining power of personal freedom; and evil is its legitimate fruit.

Sin is conditioned by freedom. Freedom is predicable only of a personal being. Hence evil, the natural consequent of sin, has its producing cause in the will of personal beings. If we inquire for the motives, there are none that seem to have any rational foundation. The will determines not to adhere to the right. The free moral agent, refusing the good, chooses to do evil. Why, is a mystery. It is an unreasonable choice, and therefore reason can furnish no adequate explanation for its existence.

In Holy Scripture we find that sin appears to have been in existence before the creation of man. The temptation in the garden of Eden, which our first parents failed to resist, and in consequence of which they fell from the state of innocence, was presented to them from without, by a personal being, symbolized by the serpent. In the book of Revelation he is called "that

ld serpent, the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." * From what the Scriptures say of him, he appears to be an individual, not merely the personification of "Cosmical" evil, but an actual person, who reasons and acts according to his own self-determination. But in addition to this, the divine record informs us of an organized kingdom of evil spirits, of which Satan is the head. Each one of these demons is a personal being, acting according to his own will, and always for the purpose of working mischief. By their sinister agency, the evils to which men are exposed are continually obstructing their pathway through life. We furthermore gather the information that the devil and all his organized host of wicked spirits were created angels, pure and holy, whose natural instincts and propensities would have led them to choose the good; but they "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation" (Jude 1: 6). Now, they are fallen angels, angels of the devil. Satan is "a deceiver," "a liar," "a murderer;" ‡ and his angels may be truly characterized by the same epithets. Satan appears to have led all the rest into sin and rebellion against God, and their whole employment consists in persistent and malignant efforts to frustrate the will of God, and to inflict misery on men. Accordingly, with such evil intent, the serpent invaded the garden of Eden, and beguiled our first parents to their own personal injury, and that of all their posterity. As they gave way to the temptation, they fell into sin against God and brought death into the world, with all the untold wretchedness and sorrow which that dreadful calamity involved.

A proper apprehension of these facts makes it very evident that sin existed, not eternally, but yet before the creation of man, and that man, very soon after his advent, was confronted with temptation and became the victim of diabolical cunning and malice, although he might, and should, have resisted the temptation, because he was entirely free to choose the right, and enjoyed all the advantages of a natural predisposition in favor of

* Rev. 12: 9; Ch. 20: 2.

† See John 8: 44.

‡ Rev. 12: 9, and 20: 3; John 8: 44.

the right. In consequence of the fall death reigns in the world, according to the warning declaration of God, when He prohibited their eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." * The transgression caused the seeds of mortality to be planted in human nature, there to grow and flourish and ripen into the harvest of death. Thus death has reigned, from the time of Adam, among men. But yet we actually find death reigning in the earth, in the world of animated nature, long before the advent of man. The sin of man, therefore, cannot be the cause of *all* death, for it is unreasonable to suppose that consequences of human sin could anticipate the commission of the sin, involving the destruction of life in the organic world, together with the cataclysms, catastrophes and revolutions in the inorganic world, which the strata of the earth reveal as having taken place prior to the creation of man. But here, in the midst of an universal reign of law, we discover the foot-prints of *Avopía*, everywhere violating and disturbing what otherwise would be a perfect, normal and harmonious unfolding of the divine system of the *κόσμος*.

The laws of nature, in their natural order, cannot come into violent conflict, without denying thereby the perfect unity of creation, or disturbing the harmony of the divine purpose in calling them into existence. These laws are, in their nature and design, harmonious, as is evident everywhere in the general tendency of nature to keep things in order, or to rectify what has become abnormal, or to restore what has been injured, or to beautify what has become unsightly. They are, indeed, sometimes opposite in their purpose, but not contradictory; and in their mutual working they may be said to modify and complement each other, thereby the more fully developing their higher concord. But no law of nature was ever designed to antagonize another or to nullify any of its results. And yet nature has been racked and torn and tortured till its wounds are visible often to the untrained eye; and thus the elements

* Gen. 2: 17.

discord and lawlessness betray their presence everywhere throughout that part of nature's domain which has been traversed by the human mind.

As nature's laws are violated, and as we cannot conceive of the Creator in any sense as the author of confusion, we must look in some other direction for the source of these evils. To the writer it seems perfectly natural to attribute this chaotic state of the world, with all its evils, to demoniac influences.

From the character imputed to evil spirits, in holy Scripture, they appear to have arrayed themselves in an attitude of irreconcilable antagonism towards God, having malignantly determined to frustrate if possible, or at least to obstruct, His wise and benevolent purposes. If they knew that the creation of the physical universe was a preparatory act, preliminary to the creation of living creatures, vegetable and animal, and that these were intended for the use and happiness of intelligent beings like men, we may well suppose that they would seize the opportunity afforded thereby to try their ingenuity in the malicious attempt to frustrate God's loving purpose. And if this be true the history revealed by geological research becomes an exhibition of the records of the sad results of demoniacal interference with the true development of nature.

The theory of evolution attempts to account for the processes through which nature has come to its present condition, on purely physical principles, allowing no room for intelligent purpose, and seeing no ethical principle involved; and thus entirely ignoring the possibility of an intelligent self-existent creator, and making matter eternal and deriving all existence, even life itself, from this material basis.

Against the doctrine of creation by an all-wise and benevolent God, they refer to the evils which appear to have been suffered in the age-long periods of geology. The animal races that inhabited the earth during the stages of its formation were successively created and annihilated after having entered upon that terrific struggle for existence even survivors of which eventually perished. They say, "Would an all-wise and infin-

itely benevolent Being create so many living beings, put them on a terrific struggle for existence, in which the weakest must succumb to the superior ingenuity and strength of the stronger, and in which even the successful strugglers must all, in the end, suffer the inevitable fate that awaits them, and die by violence, or in the course of nature, without the hope of survival? The evidences of cruelty and violence, causing untold pain and suffering, are revealed on every page of the great book of nature. The earth has, in fact, become a veritable charnel house, as the fossil remains found in every geological period abundantly testify. If there is a God, and He is so good, how can you reconcile this cruel warfare among His creatures with His benevolence? Can a being who is so good delight in so much suffering among His creatures which must be innocent of any violation of His laws?"

Such questions are exceedingly difficult to answer satisfactorily, even to ourselves. It might, indeed, be suggested that the greatest good to the noblest order of terrestrial beings could not be accomplished in any other way, and that when we come to understand the as yet unrevealed secrets of the divine purpose, it will prove a complete vindication of the ways of God, not only to mankind, but also to the rest of His vast creation. We know that many of the greatest blessings we enjoy are secured through labor and suffering.

Vicarious sacrifice seems to be the pathetic means through which we come into the possession and enjoyment of the necessities, no less than the luxuries of life. If, therefore, as it appears from this circumstance, human happiness is secured by sacrifice, may it not be that all the animal sacrifices of the geologic ages were the necessary prelude and preparation for the advent of man: that the changes, which evidently occurred during those vast periods, were necessary to fit the earth for human habitation, and that the successive revolutions which such preparation required, involved the creation and the annihilation of those many races of animals that peopled both the waters and the land? If it should prove true, in the end t

ch is the case, it would seem to indicate, in its way, the noble and important position of man among terrestrial creatures since numbered sacrifices were offered by way of anticipation of his advent.

There is unquestionably a universal feeling among men that our sinful state sacrifices must be offered, and may be effectual in securing a reconciliation with God. Among heathens the feeling is, of course, crude, and often expressed in a cruel way. But the sacrificial system of the Jews developed under divine sanction, and in fact, by divine command, affords a solid foundation for the belief, that sin must be atoned for by the shedding of blood. But that sacrifice is necessary for mankind, we have the final proof in the sacrifice of Christ, of which sacrifice all others are but types and shadows. Still this necessity of sacrifice in order to remove sin, and secure reconciliation with God, is no proof that countless numbers of animals must be sacrificed for man before he was in actual existence. The suggestion is suggested tentatively as a bare possibility, the supposition of which might serve to relieve the oppression of the individual. Neither is it offered as an apology for the conduct of the Creator, who, in the end, will doubtless solve the mystery of the satisfaction of all His creatures, even those who arraign His justice for doing what, to their minds, seems cruel and repellent; and thus He will fully vindicate His ways.

But as regards the great amount of suffering above referred to we here quote the closing paragraph from the section on the ethical aspect of the struggle for existence," in Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace's book on Darwinism, page 36: "On the whole, then, we conclude that the popular idea of the struggle for existence entailing misery and pain on the animal world is the very reverse of the truth. What it really brings about is the maximum of life and of the enjoyment of life with the minimum suffering and pain.

"Given the necessity of death and reproduction—and without these there could have been no progressive development of the organic world—and it is difficult even to imagine a system

by which a greater balance of happiness could have been secured."

This is admirably put, and we may take comfort in this belief. But yet the fact remains, that through most of the geologic ages, there was a most terrific and destructive struggle, in which, apparently, all the powers of nature, both organic and inorganic, raged with unceasing fury, and in which myriads of living creatures became victims of cruel violence and death.

It does not seem as if it was necessary, according to the original purpose of the Creator, that such a mighty death struggle should become the prelude and preparation for the advent of man on the earth. At least our short-sighted reason can form no logical argument for such a necessity that is satisfactory to reason.

May it not be possible, therefore, that all those titanic struggles were caused by the machinations of evil spirits, bent on frustrating the benevolent purposes of God? This suggestion can, of course, have no weight in any scientific mind which does not recognize the fact of creation, or the existence of a demoniac spiritual world. As the mere scientist cannot, on natural principles, demonstrate the existence of either, he rejects both, notwithstanding his scientific hypotheses often rest on *a priori* principles, such as he is ever ready to deny to the Christian theist. And while a true scientific demonstration is of unspeakable value, he is prone to forget that many of his so-called scientific demonstrations, of a given period, are extremely liable to be demolished by the more perfect observations of his successors. The history of every branch of science demonstrates this, one would think, with sufficient clearness and force to lead scientific charlatans to a more moderate estimate of the value of their own discoveries.

The Christian is not weakened in his faith because he cannot scientifically demonstrate every article of that faith. He believes in the existence of a spiritual world outside and independent of nature. He believes, too, that even finite spirits possess a preternatural power, not only because it is so declar-

in the Bible, but because he sees the effects of such power in the history of man, and in the study of the course of nature. Notwithstanding the sublime reign of law, according to which this vast universe is governed, he sees everywhere the evil effects of some disturbing power, which is in direct antagonism and conflict with its laws. This he recognizes as indicating the presence of *anomia*, or lawlessness. And this he attributes to the influence of evil spirits. If Satan could introduce sin into the world through the temptation and fall of our first parents, and thus bring about so much evil and misery among men, there is no logical reason why he could not exert an abnormal influence on the cosmical development of nature, and there also show himself the author of evil (*ὁ Πομπός*). And if he has such power, every conception we can form concerning his character would lead us to the belief that he would exercise it to the fullest possible extent.

What is true of Satan, is true also of all the angels that "kept not their first estate." They have set themselves to the task of antagonizing the will of the Creator. But as they were powerless to injure God Himself, they would exercise their hurtful influences on His creatures which they could injure. We know from observation and experience that sin is lawlessness. It comes in conflict everywhere with the laws of God and man. It is restive under the restraints of law. It seeks the destruction of all government, and would pull down and demolish it in every form, and inaugurate a reign of anarchy and lawlessness under which the good would be destroyed, and the evil run riot in its jubilee of wickedness. And since we attribute these things to the devil and his angels, who thus attempt to augment the miseries of men, and thereby find a vent for their spiteful rancor towards God, may we not also believe that the reign of terror, through which the earth passed prior to the advent of man, was the work of these demoniac agencies? In that case, their malevolence may have caused the *Tohu Vabohu* of Gen. 1: 2, that chaotic state of the earth out of which the Spirit of God brought it into the state of *Cosmos*. Thus by a lawless

intervention they would defeat the object of the creation at the very beginning, and baffle the divine purpose of manifesting His love, and glorifying His wisdom and power, in the creation and happiness of mankind.

In favor of this view we may observe that since the fall sin and evil have run parallel with the history of mankind, and with the development of the knowledge of God, and of the progressive revelation of the Messianic Kingdom. Human sinfulness, everywhere, as already intimated, tends to anarchy and ruin. It is the result of Satan's wickedness, whose aim is only to destroy. If from this we may reason backward, the analogy thus furnished might lead us to the conclusion that the revelations of the strata of the earth, and of the fossil remains imbedded therein, exhibit a long series of abnormities during the prehuman development of the earth, which are nothing else than the evil effects of demoniac agencies, working lawlessness and destruction in order to hinder the completion and perfection of the works of God. It is a demonstrated fact that men can and do modify and change the effects of natural laws; and it is not unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that evil spirits, who are more powerful than men, can turn the forces of nature to evil, and so produce destructive results.

Again, it is clear, to every devout student of holy Scripture, that the progressive revelation of the mystery of iniquity has kept pace with the ever-advancing revelation of God. Both reached their culmination "when the fulness of the time was come." Divine revelation attained the acme of its glory in the person and completed mission of the Messiah. And the devil, in mockery, or for the sake of imitation, made his boldest disclosures of himself in the demoniacal possessions which appeared during the incarnate life of Christ on earth. These seem to have been intended as a sort of diabolical travesty of the divine incarnation. But the old serpent over-reached himself. He thus opened the way for Jesus to prove His superior power by casting out the demons. Thus, in this particular, demoniac power seems to have reached its limit, and at that point

Messiah exercises His power and authority, even over these wicked powers.

But still, Satan exercises a certain dominion over nature, evidence of which we find in the introductory chapter of the book of Job; though there his dominion is limited and overruled for good. There he sends Sabeans to carry away Job's oxen and to slay their keepers. He sends fire to burn up his sheep and consume the shepherds. He sends three bands of Chaldeans to carry away his camels and to slay the servants. And at last he sends a great wind from the wilderness to smite the four corners of the house, and it fell upon and killed his children.* It may be objected here that the book of Job is, perhaps, a drama and does not deal in real historical facts. But yet all Scripture dramas mean something; and the book of Job means that God exercises, in rectitude, His government, and that it is right, even amid the deeply afflictive circumstances that often harass His children. But at the same time it incidentally exhibits Satan exercising his malignant power over nature, although that power is limited and controlled by the higher sovereignty of God.

Again, in the temptation of Christ in the wilderness the tempter openly claims dominion over the kingdoms of the world, and offers to give it to Jesus if He will fall down and worship him. But, in reply, Jesus reminds him that it is written, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve.' †

Moreover, Satanic power over nature seems to be implied when Jesus speaks to the storm on the Sea of Galilee. He seems to address the impersonal powers or forces of nature, but the ultimate ground of this rebuke lay in the fact that the disturbances of nature were caused by unclean spirits. ‡ Perhaps the 'prince of the powers of the air,' who 'raiseth winds' by the permission of God, had suspicion that He was coming now to cast that legion of devils out of the poor man,

* See Job 1: 13-19.

† Matt. 4: 8-11.

‡ Lange, Com. on Matt. 8: 26, pg. 162.

and therefore poured this storm on the ship, designing, if possible, to have sunk Him, and prevent that victory."* Or his purpose may have been more extensive than that. It may have been to destroy Jesus and the young Church, and, in this way, frustrate the object of the mission of Jesus, namely, to save mankind from sin and death. And this seems all the more probable, because of his former failures; for example, in the slaughter of the "innocents," and in the temptation in the wilderness. But that evil spirits have some limited power over the elements of nature seems indisputable. Still there is no evidence that these demons represent any original or eternal principle, as, for instance, is supposed in the Persian myth of Ahriman. In that system of belief the evil principle appears to be independent of, and almost equal to, the good principle represented by Ormuzd. Here the evil principle has a beginning, is under the control of God, can go no further in his wicked purposes than God permits, for His own wise and holy purposes, and under this government even the evil is compelled, in the end, to subserve the righteous purposes of God. Still the evil actually exists in the natural world, and though its real meaning may be obscured under the term of "Cosmical principle," yet all the evidence attainable points to the same origin as that of evil in the moral sphere. Accordingly we read of the *prince of the power of the air; the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; † the rulers of the darkness of this world; spiritual wickedness in high places; ‡ the prince of this world § (κόσμος); the god of this world || (τῷ αἰῶνος τούτου)*. All these epithets indicate the power of evil spirits over the elements and forces of nature, as it now stands; hence it is not unreasonable to conclude that the elemental disturbances of the geologic ages are attributable to diabolical influences, and that the terrific struggles, so destructive to animal life, had their origin in the same malignant powers.

* Compreh. Com. on Luke 8: 24, p. 472.

† Eph. 6: 12.

‡ John 12: 31.

† Eph. 2: 2.

|| 2 Cor. 4: 4.

VII.

JESUS CHRIST, THE GREATEST REFORMER.*

BY REV. A. S. WEBER, A.M.

ALL our knowledge of the illustrious Character, whose noble life and sovereign achievements are to be our study this evening, must be gathered from the brief narratives of the four Gospels. In those writings Jesus is never called a reformer. The purposes essayed and the results effected by Him and by His teaching, unite, however, in showing that He is pre-eminently entitled to that designation. Those purposes were nothing short of the moral and spiritual reformation of the whole human race. Those results are written in letters of light upon every page of modern civilization.

Nearly two thousand years have run their course since He finished His earthly career. But the splendor of His name remains undimmed, its power undiminished. With ever increasing influence He is multiplying His victories. The thoughtful student observes that all the history which antedated His birth looked forward to Him. That which has been made since (as that will, which remains to be made,) looks back to the same Being. In Him all things end. All things have their beginning in Him. "In Him all things hold together." Must it not follow, therefore, as a necessary consequence, that the power of Christ's life and the principles of His teaching are constantly bending or breaking in the way of reformation every

* The last of a series of lectures on "The Great Reformers," given under the auspices of Chapter 39, Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip, in the Third Reformed Church, Baltimore, Md.

unholy life, unrighteous custom, selfish maxim and wicked institution to the blessed purposes of His supreme will?

What testimony does Christian history give to this inquiry? The consideration of its reply makes it necessary to recall the condition of human society and civilization at the period in which Jesus lived. The principal constituent factors entering into the historic life of that time were, the Jewish Religion, the Philosophy of Greece, Paganism and the Roman Empire. Were these factors in their severalty or unity adequate to meet human needs, or realize divine purpose? What is the answer to be given?

The Religion of the Jews, we know, had cultivated the soil in which spiritual life and moral virtue were to grow. But within what narrow boundaries that soil was confined is sadly manifest from the New Testament. There was a small circle of Israelites in whom indeed there was no guile; but the mass of the so-called covenant people had degenerated into a wilderness overgrown to darkness by external ceremonialism which no longer had either spiritual meaning or moral power. Having proved faithless to the trust which Jehovah had committed to it, Judaism was madly hastening toward its speedy doom.

The Philosophy of Greece had long wielded an immense intellectual power. But although still swollen with haughty pride, the hollowness of its pretensions had become known, its word was generally mistrusted. It had failed to reveal the secrets of life. It had disappointed men's hopes. It had not maintained human virtue. It was utterly impotent to give peace to the heart for the present, had not a word of cheer for the future. For the guidance and help longed for, but few, therefore, continued to turn toward the wisdom of the several schools.

Paganism had long before this reached the abyss of its frightful work. Degrading the solemnities of religion itself into the means of gratifying the vilest passions, and bringing its votaries into despair, it could serve the race no better than by yielding itself to the swiftest extinction. The enormity of its nameless

vices and crimes is the only protection it has against complete exposure.

The Roman Empire, whilst it had not yet begun the last act in the extended drama of its life, had in fact already made its greatest contribution to the eternal purpose which runs through the ages. From his throne upon the Tiber, Augustus, with an iron arm, was ruling almost all the peoples of three continents. The armed legions and generals and governors of his colossal empire covered the earth. The world was enslaved to his will. A general peace was forced upon it by his power. The laws of the empire were everywhere recognized; its language, widely spoken; its customs, generally adopted. Thus it came to pass that the shameful immoralities, the hideous impurities, and the shocking crimes by which the whole social fabric of Latin society was honey-combed, spread through its influence like a deadly cancer, to every quarter of the globe. And accordingly no reformative virtue could be expected to issue from the civil power which then existed.

Contemplated from the moral and spiritual point of view, humanity, then, was "a great sweltering sea of heathen wickedness." Never has man's depravity of heart manifested itself in so universal and apparently irremediable ruin. The power of the civil law, the influence of philosophic light, the charm of pagan rite, the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Hebrew cultus—could all these have been united into one composite force it could not have availed to bring about the reformation needed in every department of public and private life.

To earnest, serious men, the future of the race looked hopelessly black. Poets and philosophers seemed at times to appreciate the awful solemnity of the situation. One sings that his hero, who is a type of suffering humanity, can never be delivered until some god descends for him into the black depths of Tartarus. Another says that man will never know God until He has revealed Himself in the guise of suffering man; and that when all is on the verge of destruction God sees the distress of the universe, and, placing Himself at the rudder,

restores it to order. A third declares that man cannot save himself; that for this purpose God comes to men—even into men. Convictions, like these, as to the desperate condition of humanity, and that the relief needed must come from beyond itself, were the necessary logical inferences to be drawn from their general knowledge of history and of personal experiences. The only ray of light still left was a faint hope in God—a hope which among the Jews looked for the Messiah, among the heathen to a God to them practically unknown.

The hour of this appalling darkness came, however, just before the dawn. Far from the busy marts of Roman commerce, far from the gay scenes of royal dissipation and unblushing licentiousness, far from the cultivated centres of Grecian refinement, in the quiet obscurity of a rural village, in the lowliness even of a rocky grotto used for sheltering beasts, the divinely-sent Deliverer of the race is born. The inhabitants of the haughty empire know it not. Did they know it, they should probably be too absorbed in worldly interests to find pleasure in so insignificant, so ordinary a thing as a new-born babe! But the fact is known, and its significance appreciated by the denizens of the celestial regions. A multitude of the heavenly host hastens to the retired spot where the event is taking place. They freight the midnight winds with heavenly music and the sweetness of their announcement is destined to become the joy of the whole world. Jesus, the Christ is born. The Sun of Righteousness has arisen with healing in His wings. The Word has become flesh and, dwelling among men, is revealing divine glory.

The date of Christ's birth synchronizes with the seven hundred and fiftieth after the foundation of Rome. This date, it may be remarked in passing, anticipates, by four years, the commonly received chronology of the year of our Lord. The error was made by Dionysius in the sixth century; and when his mistake was discovered, a thousand years afterwards, it was too late to correct it without much practical difficulty. A reference to the birth of Jesus reminds us at once of the

stupendous mystery of the Incarnation with which we are confronted at the very outset of our study of Christ's life. Of course it is not now proposed to enter upon a discussion of this central radical doctrine of the Christian Faith. With the Church Catholic, all of us, I assume, are ready to accept and confess that Jesus "was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." If so, we recognize here a fact which we are utterly unable to compass by any process of reasoning or thought, and before which it behooves us to bow down and worship in humble faith and adoring love.

And recognizing the mystery of the Birth, we are prepared to recognize also the mystery of the Person. No one trusting in the reality of history can now for a moment question the reality of a personage once living called Jesus of Nazareth. All acknowledge an individual by that name to have lived in Galilee, that His was a true human soul, endowed with all the ordinary human powers, susceptibilities, capacities and tendencies common to us all. But does that measure His entire being? Did not Jesus, by way of a gradual process of self-revelation, show Himself to be more than man? Through the manifestation of powers inherent in Him, through explicit instruction given His disciples, by positive assertion before the judge who tried Him, Jesus affirmed Himself to be at the same time also God. If we are to form anything like a correct estimate of Christ's doctrine and work, and of the results of reformation effected by both, it is fundamentally important that we should keep in mind the unexplained, the inexplicable nature of His divine-human Person. If we are to render intelligent service to Him, and persevere faithfully unto the end in our loyalty to His name, we, like the first disciples, need to know who and what He is who claims to have supreme authority over us, and who demands for Himself undivided allegiance from us.

Such knowledge was not withheld from those who drew near to Christ in the days of His flesh. "All through His ministry those who came near to him and felt the spell of His presence, His holiness, His power, were undergoing a training and a sift-

ing. Moment by moment, step by step, the accumulating evidence of His transcendently perfect humanity kept forcing upon them all more and more, the question which He would never let them escape, the question by which they were tested and judged: 'What think ye of Christ?' 'If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.'* Thus for our intellects and for our hearts it is important to know that in Christ Jesus, Deity Himself was present incarnate. He is the God-man in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. The longer one reflects upon this unique Person, the readier one will be to acknowledge with St. Paul that, "Without controversy, great is the mystery of Godliness—manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

Aside from the visit and worship of the Shepherds, and the visit and gifts of the Wise Men from the East, there was nothing extraordinary attendant upon the birth of Jesus. The Child of 'the song and of the star' was circumcised according to the regulations prescribed by Hebrew custom, and after the same manner He was subsequently presented to the Lord in the temple. Upon returning from their flight into Egypt, the parents with their Child resume their home at Nazareth, and the only thing known of Jesus for years afterwards is that He "grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

At the age of twelve He emerges for a moment from His retirement among the Galilean hills. He is seen in the temple at Jerusalem among the expounders of the law, hearing them and asking them questions, and declaring to His mother in His first recorded utterance, his conviction that He "must be about his Father's business." What an inspiring motive for noble living that conviction thenceforward must have been in the career of this Youth of Nazareth! It throws as it were, a ray of light into the years that are now immediately before Him, allowing us to see, if nothing more, at least the bent of mind with which Jesus enters upon the earlier period of personal accountability.

* The Rev. R. C. Moberly, in "The Incarnation as the Basis of Doctrine."

So far as the Scriptures are concerned, the eighteen years that follow are veiled in impenetrable obscurity. Not one word is recorded to tell us what He was doing during these years; nothing as to the thoughts He was entertaining, or the purposes and plans He was forming. Incidentally He is once referred to as the Carpenter, from which it is inferred that during all that time His hands were engaged in honest and useful toil—toil by which He was winning bread for Himself and His widowed mother.

The whole of His time and attention, it is evident, however, were not given to the duties of the workshop. The mind which at the age of twelve astonished the learned by its "combinative insight and discerning answers,"* was not to be held in check by chisel, saw or plane. Somehow time was found to learn the Hebrew Scriptures, through and through. Were not the words of Moses and the Prophets so familiar to Him that at every exigency of His public ministry the apt and decisive quotation sprang promptly to His lips? During those years whatever other work may have engaged His efforts, He acquired a knowledge of the sacred writings, and of the God revealed in them, and at the same time came into possession also of equally profound knowledge of human life and of the human heart.

The age of thirty, at which He enters upon the duties of His public life, finds Him equipped accordingly "with the largest results of practical observation, and with the keenest insight into the tangled maze of human passions and interests. In comparison with Christ's knowledge of men and of man, so keen yet so sympathetic, so quick and so profound, the greatest master in this sphere falls below what can be called the second place. Thus in His student days at Nazareth, with no other means of culture than might be acquired by any humble artisan, He learned God as no philosophy or theology could teach. He learned man so that the contributions of history and literature were superfluous to Him. He also learned nature, with a love and an insight and sense of fellowship which the nineteenth

* See Edersheim's "Jesus the Messiah," Vol. I, p. 247.

century feels to be accordant with its own sentiments. So those quiet years at Nazareth were teeming years. A mind crowded with thoughts, a heart filled to overflowing with human interests and sympathies, and responsive to every suggestion of night and mountain and flower and field, can alone account for the richness of soul revealed to the world when the Messianic summons came. The power of the genius by which all these stores were acquired, and all these insights attained, was the pure heart which sees God, and in the divine light finds all things open and manifest." *

Of the personal appearance of Jesus, either at this time or before or after, we know nothing. It is well, no doubt, that the authentic records omit description of His outward presence. Far more important is it for us to know the mystery of His birth, the nature of His Person and the spotlessly pure and absolutely holy character with which He entered upon, prosecuted and finished His reformatory work. For knowing Him, in these respects to differ from all other men, we shall expect Him to entertain views as to the reformation needed, and as to the methods by which it was to be effected, which are essentially different from the views and methods of other reformers.

Savonarola, for instance, finding the government of Florence tyrannically harsh and oppressive, its rulers ambitious and immoral, attempted a reformation of the government by hurling violent denunciations against the sin and sinners of his time. Luther, discovering the doctrines of the Church to be erroneous and misleading, undertook a doctrinal reformation by methods which commended themselves to him as warranted by circumstances, and efficient for securing the end sought. Zwingli, seeing the corrupt morals of his age, sought to bring about a moral reformation by the preaching of the love and of the forgiveness of God. When Jesus inaugurated His work evils similar to these, we have seen, were everywhere to be observed. Religion, philosophy, government, morality, public and private, showed melancholy signs of needing to be reformed. But the greatest Re-

* The Rev. Charles H. Dickinson, in "The Perfecting of Jesus."

former of the ages made no direct attempt to reform particular errors, seemed not to care to reshape circumstances, governments or institutions until the root of the matter had been reached in the regeneration of men. His penetrating wisdom had taught Him how utterly futile it is to look for good fruit from the tree of human life so long as the worm of sin and death, gnawing at its heart, is not destroyed. He knew and taught, what even modern reformers are slow in learning, that all real and lasting reformation must begin with the regenerate heart and thence issue in righteousness and holiness of life.

Holding such views there is nothing strange, therefore, that at the opening of His public life, Jesus should demand what no teacher prior to Him had presumed to ask, namely, a new birth. The great Teacher come from God would not be satisfied simply with a man's external conformity to a moral pattern, however respectable that pattern might outwardly appear. For the meeting of Christian requirements it will not do to lop off a sin here, a vice there, and an error elsewhere in a life. Men with all the trappings of conventional moral respectability were known to Jesus, but to become disciples of His more than that was demanded. In His view the radical necessity for the reformation of fallen humanity is a birth from above, without which no man can see or enter into the heaven of perfect peace and abiding joy. And this view from which He never swerved during the three years of His official labors, determined the methods He employed in the pursuit of the work which had been given Him to do.

Here, then, we have the explanation of two facts in Christ's career which have sometimes puzzled the students of His life: First, why He should have opened His official ministry with benedictions instead of the promulgation of laws; and second, why He should have been content with so small a number of disciples as the reward of His laborious years on earth. He began His ministry with benedictions, because it was by the acceptance of what He had come to give, rather than by cold conformity to the letter of the law, that men were to be blessed with the re-

formed life needed by them and desired by God. Having seen men "dead in trespasses and sin," Jesus had come that believing in Him "they might have life and have it more abundantly." By accepting Him they accepted the regenerating power from above which secured for them not only deliverance from the bondage to the law, but warrant also for trust in the comforts of the Beatitudes: "Blessed, the poor in spirit; blessed, they that mourn; blessed, the meek; blessed, they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; blessed, the merciful; blessed, the pure in heart." Rightly interpreted words like these standing at the very heart of the Gospel, have immeasurably more power than the words of the Law for effecting reformation from error and sin, as well as for quickening and sustaining effort for holy and Christlike living. Men cannot be legislated out of sin, nor educated out. They must be loved out, blessed out. "God so loved the world,"—that is the key-note of the redemptive scheme, that must guide and sustain the song of the Gospel to its finishing chord.

Jesus was content with a small number of disciples because He knew that the ultimate success of His purpose depended not upon large numbers of disciples at the beginning or even at the end of His earthly work. Eternity was before Him; therefore He wrought not for a day. He was concerned to regenerate a single heart, or the hearts of a few, rather than technically to reform simply the external morals and customs, the maxims and institutions of a country, a race or an age. To change the latter without new-creating the former, he knew would in the end result only in failure. The devils of evil, in one or another form, would sooner or later return to a house swept and garnished, and make the last state of society worse than the first. To effect the former, even though it might be only in a single soul, or in a mere handful of faithful followers, would necessarily result finally in converting the kingdoms of this world into the kingdoms of God and of His Christ.

Prior to His crucifixion Jesus had said that the kingdom of God was "like leaven which a woman took and hid in three

measures of meal till *the whole* was leavened." Subsequent to the Resurrection, when all authority in heaven and earth had been given to Him, He commanded His disciples to "go into all the world and disciple all nations." With varying degrees of rapidity and success, the work enjoined in this commission has been doing, and even a casual survey of Christian facts warrants the hope that the permeating, reforming influences of the gospel are hastening the time when the entire race shall have felt its power, as this is predicted in the parable.

He would be a bold man, therefore, who should claim that Christ's views were mistaken, and that His methods were not the best for accomplishing a true and lasting reformation. Advanced skeptics even have not the hardihood to deny that Jesus has altered the entire current of human life, both as regards the individual and society. Renan, who certainly has not been studying the Gospels with an unprejudiced mind, feels constrained to say that "Jesus was the individual who made the species take the greatest step towards the Divine." Lecky, in whose mind a rationalistic bias is often manifest, declares that "it was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character which, through all the changes of eighteen centuries, has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love, has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments and conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice, and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists." * Richter speaks of Jesus as "the holiest among the mighty, the mightiest among the holy, who with His pierced hands has lifted empires off their hinges, turned the stream of centuries out of its channels, and still governs the ages."

Appreciative testimony like this, which might readily be multiplied from a thousand additional sources, distinctively

* Lecky's "History of European Morals," Vol. II., pp. 8-9.

Christian, is valuable chiefly because it ascribes reforming power not only to the principles of truth inculcated and to the doctrines taught by Jesus, but to Jesus Himself. True, Christian principles and doctrines have done much in the way of transforming life and character in human society. Under their influence the morality and spiritual life of humanity would have received an upward impulse such as no ethical or philosophical system, ancient or modern, would have had the power of exerting. But, after all, it is not to abstract principles or teachings of the Christ that the unexampled moral and spiritual uplift given to our race by Christianity is to be ascribed. That power has come chiefly from Christ Himself.

He has set before men the supreme and absolutely perfect ideal of human life, and by uniting our lives with His through the gift of His indwelling Spirit, has made it possible for us not only to see and admire, but actually to reach out for, and in the end obtain for our own, the ideal thus set before us. And this is a deeply important matter. For is it not one thing to exhibit and gain admiration for an ideal, and a thing totally different to aspire for and at last win the ideal itself by its helpful and stimulating influence? Artists, by their creations on canvas or in stone, do the former; Jesus Christ alone has succeeded in accomplishing the latter by livingly uniting men with Himself.

The disciples whom He chose and trained had no lesson to learn that was more difficult in many respects than this of their "mystical union" with the Master. Now in this form and now in that it was repeatedly pressed upon their attention, and when at last the greatness of the fact itself was realized, they knew what it was to be "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might." They then appreciated that seeing Him as He is, meant in the end being like Him. After His bodily presence was no longer visibly present with them, they could still confidently and gratefully declare: We "can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth" us. This experience of the apostles, which is not exceptional, but by intent exemplary,

demonstrates that the powers of the God-united humanity are made available through the Spirit for every man. "The life of the Incarnate has not vanished from the earth; it is perpetuated through spiritual channels in the race of the spiritually redeemed. The 'New Man,' like the 'old man,' exhibits Himself as a self-propagating type, self-propagating by its own laws, having its seed in itself like every lower form or stage of life that has yet appeared." * Upon the basis, therefore, of the mutual incorporation of Christ and man, recognized in the well-known verse of one of our hymns,

"My life in Thee, Thy life in me,"

must we account for the ennobled condition in which the best civilization of our day surpasses that of antiquity, even as the vaulting heavens are higher than the earth. The new factor introduced by Christ has transformed the character of multitudes in every age; it has vivified man's cold and selfish heart by a new enthusiasm; it has redeemed, regenerated and emancipated the most depraved of human kind; it has wrought reformation in religion and philosophy, in customs and government, in principles and practices, in knowledge and institutions the world over, such as never have been, never can be paralleled by any other force.

Observe how this reforming power of Jesus is shown by the loftier conception of man now entertained everywhere in Christian lands. At the time of Christ's advent, notwithstanding the revelations of the Hebrew religion, the wisdom of the Grecian philosophy, and the protection of Roman law, what estimate did man put upon himself and his fellow-men? The course of every human being was too generally regarded as an aimless pageant. Men, even at their best, were nothing more than poor, suffering, worthless players, strutting for a little hour a mimic stage, and then destined to vanish forever.

Christ's life and teaching dispelled that delusion from the minds of His first followers, and their convictions have been

* Valling's "The Divine Man," page 220.

shared by succeeding generations ever since. Christian men know that every human life has originated in the wise and loving intention of God, and, that imperfect and sinful though that life may be, it is still capable of answering to sublime purposes here, and unless willfully obdurate to all the overtures of divine mercy, capable also of a blissful immortality. Despite the fact that the beauty of the divine imageship and likeness has been marred by his own acts, man is assured that he is still near and dear to the heart of God. Otherwise the Father could not have sent His Son into the world in order that the world through Him might be saved.

Being the object of divine regard, as taught by the word and confirmed by the work of Jesus, a man cannot overlook or deny the value of himself or of his fellow-men. That inference is immediate and unavoidable. And the impulse that it gives to the life of men is immense and continuous, as may be seen along the entire line of Christian effort and the spread of God's kingdom.

Observe also how this reforming power of Jesus is evidenced in the more just and vivid, the more elevating and inspiring conception of God now held wherever the sovereign instruction of the Gospel has gone. Some one has made the assertion—and personally I regard it true—that the greatest desideratum of our day for religious and theological, and even for practical, moral purposes, is a thoroughly Christian conception of God. If this is so now, what must be thought of man's needs in this regard prior to Christ and the writing of the New Testament? Outside the Jewish world God was a projection only of man himself into the invisible regions, governed by the same motives, prejudices and passions, and pleased with the same foibles and follies which gave delight to men. What Jesus did for man in this superlative department of thought can be measured when we call into clear remembrance what He by word and life taught us concerning Deity. God is a Spirit, the infinitude of whose blessed attributes can not be measured by the plummet of human reason. Thoroughly personal, He is omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, unchanging, and in character holy. As to

the essence of His being, the words "love," "life" and "light" approximate most nearly to an adequate description. He is "Our Father."

This idea of God, made familiar to the mind of the world through Jesus Christ, is the grandest, tenderest and most inspiring, men have ever received. "As the tides are lifted beneath the unseen pull of the moon, so human aspiration must be exalted when the vision of the infinite Author of the universe rises above it in majestic distinctness. As flowers and trees respond with blossoms, brilliant and fragrant, to the kiss of the sunshine when spring replaces the icy winter, so whatever is noblest in man, and whatever is most delicate, must answer to the appeal of a radiant discovery of the presiding Personal Glory from which order and life, power and love, incessantly proceed."*

Great seed-truths like these, intended to yield abundant harvests, were constantly sown by Christ as He journeyed up and down the rugged paths of Palestine with His disciples. Particulars as to these must be gathered from the evangelical narratives. His sublime teachings are there seen to be constantly illustrated by divine living. To confirm the truth of both He wrought signs and wonders such as He distinctly and unequivocally declared, no other man had done. He healed the sick, cleansed lepers, gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf and life to the dead. And though conscious that His career was soon to come to a tragical termination, He could rejoice not only because He had personally glorified his Father's name, but because it would continue to be glorified forever by the members of the Kingdom which He had established in the midst of men.

Of this the evidences began to be seen, and with constantly increasing glory they have been multiplying, from the very day on which His first disciples were chosen. Witness the richer and purer moral life which Christ's word and example, by the aid of His Spirit, have established among men. Witness the religious reformation which has been wrought—a reformation before which all others dwindle into the utmost insignificance.


* Storrs' "Divine Origin of Christianity," page 35.

Religion, instead of being a thing of outward rite and sacrifice, severed from life, is life itself, informed throughout by a true spiritual reverence and worship of God and by a sincere desire to conform in principle and conduct to the divine Will.

Witness, moreover, the benign power exerted by Christ and His teachings upon the relations subsisting between man and man. When Jesus was born vast multitudes were in the bondage of slavery. Upon these the haughty temper of their masters perpetrated terrible cruelties. Behold now what Christ has wrought! The legal and social status of these multitudes has been changed. The lofty wall, which seemed strong enough for all ages, to separate the classes, has yielded to the levelling, equalizing power of the Gospel. Instead of saying, as they once did, "We are better than you," men who are "transformed by the renewing of their minds" through the Spirit, cheerfully acknowledge, "You are as good as we." Christians recognize a common Father, and themselves as brethren entitled, therefore, all alike to the blessings promised to God's children.

The relation of society to woman has been changed to an equivalent degree by the same beneficent power. The pitiable position she to-day occupies among Pagan nations was once her lot everywhere. Christ has reformed that relation. His attitude towards women was the germ of their whole subsequent enfranchisement. The added protection, the enlarged opportunity, the tender recognition now accorded her by every true Christian man is a gift to her of Him who was the Son of Mary. This gift has not led her to forfeit her womanly glory; rather to perfect it in the love of her Lord. Her intensity of faith, the reckless completeness of her self-consecration to noble aims constitute a prophecy of the great things to be done by her when Christ's full reformation shall have placed her side by side with her brethren in perfect equality.

So the relation of man to the feebleness of child-life has also been altered. Before Jesus had lived and taught there was beyond the bounds of Israel scarcely any public recognition of duty towards little children. No chapter of heathen history is so



expressively sad as that which recounts the dealings of the State and of parents with those of innocent and helpless years. Children were left entirely to the perverse and fitful instincts of parents for their protection, training, succor and nurture; or if left to the State, to suffer from greater neglect if possible, and more aggravated inflictions of pain. The maxim by which fathers and mothers were governed in dealing with their offspring was seemingly the same as that of tyrants: "Muscularly I am able, therefore morally I may." And the resultant atrocities are too well known to call for description in this presence. Christ's sweet and gracious dealings with little children, and His tender references to them, have wrought changes which testify with deepest emphasis how happy has been the benefit wrought by the Gospel for the helpless estate of the little child.

Witness, in addition, the hallowing effect of the same reforming power upon the relation of society toward the aged and infirm, the ignorant and poor, the dependent, and criminal classes. We need not stay to speak with minuteness about these. On every hand all around us there are living and gratifying illustrations of the improved condition which those people enjoy under the Gospel. How large and generous the provision which is made for the comfort and happiness of those upon whom the burdens and infirmities of age are resting! How lavish the expenditure of money to provide opportunities for acquiring an education, even to the humblest of the poor! How bounteous the charities which support the numerous institutions dedicated to the relief of those whose impaired faculties or afflicted bodies make them dependent upon others' care! And in this care for others, it is not forgotten to make provision even for the fallen and criminal classes. The inhuman punishments have been reformed, the severities of their incarceration have been softened, and Christian effort is active in season and out of season in behalf of their protection against injustice, and for their reclamation, if possible, to deserved freedom from the restraints of the law. With reference to all these, Christian governments and institutions have been brought

under the moulding, reforming power of Christ's Spirit, and, like the Church, they now know not any distinctions of rich or poor, learned or unlearned, race or class. All have been glorified, as it were, into a higher life, through the transforming power of Jesus, the Christ.

Those chosen of God to originate reformations of this character, and to ameliorate the condition of mankind, are always the victims of their own calling. That seems to be a law governing every nation, and across that of the Jews it was written in letters of blood. Elijah, Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, John the Baptist, all of these heroic men, Jesus knew, became the victims of priestly or royal power, or of the passions of the people. He was conscious that the accomplishing of His work meant for Himself a similar end. The end came not unexpectedly. He became a willing victim of the accursed cross, knowing that when lifted up to that commanding height, He should be able "to draw all men unto himself." That prophetic word of His, like many others, declared His conviction that His work was not finally done; that He expected it not to be done, when, with His lips trembling in death, He commended His spirit into the hands of His Father.

And so His reforming work goes constantly forward. It runs like a stream of life and glory through the ages. What He undertook is not yet fully accomplished. Kingdoms arrayed against kingdoms, the turbulence of vice in many individuals and nations, unconquered, villains revelling in their craft, assassins gratifying their thirst for blood, the weak oppressed by the strong, the innocent suffering from the guilty—these and like facts show that Christ must continue His reforming work still further before the evolution of history shall result in perfected society. The past of this process is full of hope and promise for the future. His sovereign rule and authority will ultimately find universal acknowledgment, and then in the new earth and new heaven wherein dwelleth righteousness, men shall be like Christ, sweet in sympathy, pure in holiness, vital with love, and His reforming work be fully realized.

VIII.

CRISTIANITY A LIFE.

BY THE REV. AMBROSE M. SCHMIDT.

For nearly nineteen centuries the name of Christ has been on the lips of friend and foe as has been no other name. For nineteen centuries Christianity has permeated and colored the thought and literature of the civilized nations of the earth.

In a like period of time the Religion of THE CHRIST has formed and recreated individuals and nations, and the end is yet. Notwithstanding all this, men—Christian men—are more or less divided in opinion when called on to give an answer to the question, "What is Christianity?" By some, Christianity is apprehended primarily as Revelation or Doctrine; by others, as a Religious Experience; by others, as Character; by still others, as a Life.

In the midst of such diversity as this, can we find an answer to the question, "What is Christianity?" that will prove all-comprehensive? Is Christianity any one of these, or is it all these?

Science recognizes two methods of investigation whereby the form or character of a substance may be known, one the analytic the other the synthetic. Which do we need in order that we may gain a full and clear apprehension of Christianity, the Religion of the Christ, the Religion of the eternal and natural God?

Will our knowledge of the parts determine our knowledge of the whole or *vice versa*?

Both methods are legitimate, both are really necessary parts

of one and the same system, yet for our present purpose we prefer the latter method. Know the whole and the parts are known. To return—When Christianity is defined as Revelation or Doctrine, Religious Experience or Character, we are asked to accept definitions which answer to certain phases of or essential elements in Christianity, but are not all-embracing nor all-comprehensive.

As the plant is more than roots, stem, leaves, branches, tissue, sap, bud and flowers, so Christianity is more than any one of these—yea, more than all of them taken together. The plant is primarily a living organism, as also is Christianity a living organism. The Religion of Christ is the only one of all the religions in the world in which the life of its founder is necessary for its perpetuity. Zarathustra, Gautama, Confucius may or may not have lived. Their teachings are mere moral and ethical principles, and do not require the life of him who set forth these precepts.

Mohammedism bears the name of its founder, but his followers are free to acknowledge that Mahomet is dead. Because Mahomet is dead, therefore, Mohammedism must die; it is even now disintegrating, for it has no life in it. It is recorded that when Mahomet died, Abu Bekr, who afterwards became the first Caliph, went forth from the chamber of death proclaiming, "Whoso worshipeth Mahomet let him know that Mahomet is dead; but whoso worshipeth God let him know that God liveth and dieth not."

In this one thing the uniqueness of the Christian Religion is manifest. It is the religion of a living Person—a religion that is permeated by His life, quickened and energized by His Spirit, and because of this ever-living, ever-present Spirit of Christ Christianity cannot die, for the Son of God "liveth and dieth not."

In the early Church, before the facts and truths of the Master's life had lost their living reality and had been exchanged for dogmas, Christianity was recognized as a living power, present in the hearts of believers, permeating, transforming

d recreating them. St. Paul exclaims, in writing to the Galatians: "I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith."

The Christianity of the martyrs was not merely a matter of religious experience, revelation nor doctrine; not a mere question of conduct nor of character, but a question of life, personal life communion with God through a personal endeavour.

In answer to the attacks made upon them, the early defenders of the faith proudly pointed to the effect of this new religion upon the lives of its professors. Said an early writer: "They pass their days on earth but are citizens of heaven. They obey the prescribed laws, and at the same time surpass the laws by their lives. They love all men, and are persecuted by all." Very early, however, in the mediæval period, there was manifested a tendency to regard Christianity rather as a revelation than as a life, and to understand by revelation mainly a system of dogmas or doctrines. Such a condition of affairs most easily opened the way for the age of Intellectualism. Here, faith is represented not so much as a personal trust in a living Saviour as an assent to a system of doctrines in which the will of the individual is alone active in accepting the doctrines of the Church. Faith meant intellectual assent to certain dogmas or traditions. With such *credo* as this the Church readily passed into the ecclesiastical phase, a phase of organization. The mighty structure of the Roman hierarchy rapidly arose and Christianity became a formulary of traditional or doctrinal precepts accepted and obeyed by those who were named Christians. So great stress was laid upon the necessity of works that faith, a living personal faith, almost ceased to be looked for or required in the individual believer.

Then came the age of mysticism, and after that the evangelical age. Now repentance and faith take the place of

obedience and works. The Reformation introduced an age of Evangelical Christianity and produced a great variety of phases, prominent among which was Experimentalism.

Christianity henceforth must be a matter of experience; something to be felt, tried, proven and if found worthy of confidence, accepted and believed in. The latter days of Experimentalism are upon us. What of the future? says a recent writer. "The laws of progressive religion operate like those of politics, and are governed by antecedent habits. From some of the tendencies of modern Christians we may gauge what the nature of their coming forth may be," then he adds later on: "From these evidences we gather that the new phase of Christianity will be one of conduct." In so far as he makes conduct the outward expression of an inward life, his statement may stand, but very much of so-called Christian conduct has very little that is in sympathy with the demand for a life that is lived in and with Christ Jesus, who is Himself the only source of all life and the only Fountain from whence can flow that real spirit-life requisite for all true Christian conduct or character. All character—all good character—is not necessarily Christian character; indeed, may it not be said that all good character (morally good) does not become Christian character!

Morality is not Christianity, though for many those two terms appear to be synonymous.

It was the character of Christ as manifested by Him which caused the germinal faith of His disciples to unfold, but the revelation of His character was the revelation of His life. In John 2: 11, we read: "This beginning of his signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory (character): and his disciples believed on him." For them, however, Christianity meant nothing less than a *personal, living union with a living personal Christ*.

That the Religion of Christ is more than Revelation or Doctrine—yea, more than the Scriptures themselves—is manifest from the words of our Saviour as He addressed the Jews when in Jerusalem attending the feast: "Ye search the Scriptures,"

He said, "because ye think that in them ye have eternal life: and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life." John 5: 40. The Scriptures were given to them as a means to an end. They erred in that they made what was designed merely as a means, serve for them as the end. They rested their faith in the Scriptures.

So men err to-day when Christianity is apprehended primarily, as revelation or doctrine (a learned theologian's statement to the contrary notwithstanding): "These are they which bear witness of me." Finger-boards they are, pointing the way to the fountain of life, but unable of themselves to give to men that life. Nowhere do we read: "He that believeth in the Scriptures hath eternal life," but plainly it is taught that "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life," John 3: 36. Again, the Religion of Christ is more than Personal Experience or character. Personal Experience may aid in attaining to true Christian character; conduct may afford personal experience and evidence the nobility of character, but that which is born of the flesh remains flesh, and is of the earth earthy unless there be a dying unto the old Adamic life and an implanting into, a living of the new Adamic life. St. Paul, in writing to the Colossians, boldly affirms: "For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God."

What can he mean but that they, as Christians, were living a new life in Christ, a life differing in all things from their former life? In his High Priestly prayer (John 17: 3) Jesus says: "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ."


Here knowledge, at first sight, might appear to mean a knowledge gained through intellectual apprehension or experience. "The word 'know' does not express perfect but inceptive and ever-growing knowledge." Knowledge of the Father and of the Son is neither the condition of the life nor life itself. Life is that state in which we are introduced to the knowledge of the Father and the Son, and when that life is perfected in us we shall know them as they are. Knowledge is therefore

dependent on life, for there can be no knowledge without life, and the life which they who are in Christ now have is *eternal life*.

The tendency of the age seems to be rather to hold eternal life before the Christian as a reward to be given hereafter, instead of a present possession. Let this latter truth receive due emphasis and the Religion of Christ can no longer be apprehended as mere Revelation, Doctrine, Experience or Character. Christianity is not one of the many religions of the world, but the only religion that offers eternal life as a present possession. If this be true, can we rest satisfied with any definition of Christianity that does not sum up or embrace all of its many phases in that one, all-comprehensive word *LIFE*! That eternal life is now offered to the believer; that eternal life is the present possession of those who have "put on Christ" is clearly taught both by Christ Himself and by the Apostles.

Hear our Master speak: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath* eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day," John 6: 54. Hear the beloved John declaring: "And the witness is this, that God *gave* unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son *hath the life*, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life. These things have I written unto you that ye may know that *ye have eternal life*, even unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God," 1 John 5: 11-13. Through faith we are made partakers of this life, the believer receiving his new life from Him who is the source of all life.

There are Christians and Christians, just as there are Americans and Americans real and nominal. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven," Matt. 7: 21. Many there are who have been named Christians; who have been implanted into Christ through the sacrament of baptism; who have publicly confessed Christ as their Master, yet for whom the Church of Christ possesses no more merit than an ordinary fraternal circle or



brotherhood. They have been ingrafted into the vine but have failed to appropriate the life of the vine. They have never grown. Notwithstanding the fact that there are many lifeless members in the Church of Christ their presence in nowise contravenes the truth that Christianity is a life. The presence of lifeless branches on a tree does not warrant the inference that the tree itself is lifeless, so long as the tree has many other branches that bear foliage and fruit. It is, however, an evidence that these lifeless branches have failed to take up into themselves the life of the tree. In other words, Confession is not necessarily an evidence of living faith. Hearing joined to confession will not insure any man's salvation. The receiving of the word and the doing of the Master's will—these are the fruits whereby the confessor and hearer evidences the fact that his life is nourished by Christ's life, and that for Him Christianity means a life union with a living Christ. The Church is the body of Christ. The believers are members of His body. This community of believers incorporate in His body are known as Christians. The religious belief which they profess is named Christianity—so named because of that personal Christ who lives in His Church by His Spirit, and through His Spirit dwells in the hearts of His believers. The Religion of Christ, the Religion of the Eternal and Natural Son of God is therefore primarily a life—IT IS LIFE ITSELF!

Apprehend Christianity as a life and Revelation, Doctrine, Experience and Character will flow forth as the natural streams of one common fountain, each revealing distinct phases of that life, yet each finding its source in Him whose ever-present Spirit abideth in the hearts of believers, in whose lives is mirrored the image of the only begotten Son of God, whose followers we are.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS. A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. By Milton S. Terry, S. T. D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in Garrett Biblical Institute. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892. Price, \$3.00.

This is a handsome volume of 500 pages, and treats with ability the subjects usually considered in such a treatise. We can freely commend it for use in this department. What it explains in reference to the principle of interpretation in general, and of the interpretation of the Bible in particular, is very important and necessary. But we have felt for some years that sufficient attention is not given in such treatises to the *difference* between the Bible and all other books. What is this difference? Briefly, it is that the Bible treats of supernatural, revealed truth, whereas all other books treat of what we may designate as natural truth, or truth in the sphere of the natural creation. But, it is said, is not all truth one? In one sense, yes; in another sense, no. The truth in the Bible relates to the *new creation* in Christ Jesus, and in order to apprehend this order of truth it is necessary first of all to have a proper idea of, and faith in, that creation. Just as knowledge of the person of Christ cannot be attained to merely by the natural reason, but requires faith in the supernatural constitution of His person, so it is necessary, first of all, to grasp the unique character of truth as it holds in the new creation, in order to come *en rapport* with the teaching of the inspired Scriptures. We approve all that is given in this work as proper and necessary in order to a right interpretation of the Bible, but it needs to be supplemented, in our opinion, by a proper representation of the difference between the Bible and all other books. The Bible is not only the *Word of God*; nature is also, in a sense, a word of God; but the Bible is the word of God in relation to a new order of supernatural truth revealed in Jesus Christ. Then a central principle must be found for a right interpretation of the Scriptures. This centre of the Scriptures is the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the light and life of the Bible. Christ said to the Jews: "Ye do search the Scriptures because in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which TESTIFY OF ME." St. Paul studied the Scriptures for years without understanding the first truth they con-

ained. When he learned to know Christ he saw *Him* in every page, and now came to a new understanding of the sacred record. Hence we would start our Hermeneutics with a consideration, first of all, of what the Bible is, and then the central principle of the Bible, and then take up what is presented in this volume. We would like to extend these remarks, but we shall reserve what else we have to say for a future occasion.

HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS. By Rev. J. S. Exell, M. A., and Rev. T. H. Seale, A. K. C. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1892. Price, \$3.00.

This is the first volume of the American authorized edition of "The Preacher's COMPLETE HOMILETIC COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT." The entire work has been recently completed in London, and has been received with much enthusiasm by many of the clergy of all denominations. It is the purpose of the publishers to issue an American edition from plates supplied by the English publishers, and, if they can secure sufficiently large advance orders, put the price at about one-half that of the English edition, which imported in single sets costs about \$60 per set.

The publishers say: "Among the special features of this great work which have influenced us in our determination to print an American edition are:

"1st. The exhaustive character of this Commentary. Its editors claim (and their claim seems justified) that the work opens up for homiletic use every available verse or paragraph of the Old Testament that can be turned to homiletic advantage. For instance, notwithstanding the paucity of homiletic literature on the Book of Jeremiah, the volume on Jeremiah will be found to contain in brief or fuller form about eight hundred and fifty suggestive treatments of texts for sermon use, among which are no fewer than four hundred and seventy sermon outlines upon texts which appear, so far as literature affords evidence, to have been hitherto unused by preachers. The same is true to a greater or less degree of the Book of Kings and other portions of the Old Testament which have hitherto been but sparsely used as sources for texts for sermons.

"2d. The Commentary is the work of a score of distinguished homilists (see enclosure). The original work in the volumes is of the highest excellence, and the selections have been made with great skill and discrimination. Every effort has been made on the part of the learned editors to store in these volumes the best of the homiletic study of all ages and of all countries. Besides the indices in the several volumes there is an elaborate and copious index volume to the whole. The work is most highly commended by preachers and by the press of England."

As a rule homiletical commentaries are not the best for a critical study of the Scriptures, but every rule has its exceptions. The

danger with them is that they make moral lessons the principal object of study, and these moral lessons become merely *naturalistic*, i.e., they overlook the deep spiritual sense of Scripture as a *super-natural* revelation. But the volume before us seems to do full justice to the proper sense of the text, and in addition gives its homiletical use. It is adapted to the wants of ministers, and will no doubt circulate largely among them.

THE BOOK OF JOB. By Robert A. Watson, D.D., author of "Judges and Ruth," "Gospels of Yesterday," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 E. Tenth Street, 1892. Price, \$1.50.

This volume belongs to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible." It is an interesting work on an interesting subject.

Of the book of Job Thomas Carlyle says: "It is one of the grandest things ever written by man, a noble book—a book for all men. Such living likenesses were never since drawn. Sublime sorrow, sublime reconciliations; oldest choral melody, as of the heart of manhood; so soft and great as the summer midnight; as the world with its seas and stars,—there is nothing written, I think, of equal literary merit." Dr. Watson designates it "the first great poem of the soul in its mundane conflict, facing the inexorable of sorrow, change, pain and death, and feeling within itself at one and the same time weakness and energy, the hero and the serf, brilliant hopes, terrible fears;" and he further asserts that "with entire veracity and amazing force this book represents the never-ending drama renewed in every generation and in every genuine life."

In his exposition of this sublime book, this grand and divinely-inspired poem, Dr. Watson is very happy. In an attractive and elegant style he elucidates its character and wisely comments on its contents. No one we think can read his masterly exposition without feeling thankful to him for its preparation. We heartily commend it therefore to all interested in Bible study. The learned and the unlearned can alike read it with profit.

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. By the Rev. James Denny, B. D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 E. Tenth Street, 1892. Price, \$1.50.

This volume, also, like the one just noticed, forms part of "The Expositor's Bible." It presents a highly interesting, as well as an able and instructive exposition of the earliest of the Epistles of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. Among the subjects discussed are, "The Signs of Election," "Conversion," "Charity and Independence," "The Dead in Christ," "The Day of the Lord," "The Ministry of Sin," and "The Christian Worth of Labor." The comments of the author are throughout very judicious and deserving of careful consideration. The work is in every respect worthy of a place in the series to which it belongs, which is high praise.

FROM THE USHER'S DESK TO THE TABERNACLE PULPIT. The Life and Labors of Charles Haddon Spurgeon. By Rev. Robert Shindler, author of "Northram Hall," etc. Fourth Thousand. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East 10th Street, near Broadway. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon was a truly apostolic man. As a preacher he made a deep impression on the age in which we live. The life of such a man is always worth studying. The present volume is therefore a desirable one. That its statements may be accepted as correct is vouched for by the fact that the proof-sheets of this "Life," with the exception of those of the last chapter, were revised at Mentone under Mr. Spurgeon's supervision during his last illness. Besides the facts of his life, the volume also contains a number of portraits of Mr. Spurgeon, taken at different times, together with other interesting illustrations which adds to its value.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Vol. XVI., Jeremiah xx.—Daniel. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, London and Toronto. Price, \$1.50.

In this volume Dr. Parker presents to us his discourses on the later chapters of Jeremiah, together with those on the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, and the Book of Daniel. These discourses are all distinguished by brilliant rhetoric and strikingly expressed thought. To ministers of the gospel they will prove themselves highly suggestive, and to readers generally they can scarcely fail to be edifying and inspiring. As in the previous volumes of this series, the discourses are supplemented by "Handfuls of Purpose," drawn from the texts and topics, and especially prepared for the use of teachers. The volume also contains a number of prayers.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE BOOK OF RUTH. By M. C. Horine, A.M., Pastor of St. James' Lutheran Church, Reading, Pa. With an Introduction by Rev. Eli Huber, D.D., Pastor of Messiah Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, Pa. Lutheran Publication Society, No. 42 North Ninth St., Philadelphia, Pa. Price, 50 cents.

These Reflections were originally prepared for the members of the author's own congregation, and presented to them in nine discourses which form the chapters of this little volume. They are of a truly practical character, and cover the whole Book of Ruth in a clear, connected and orderly way. They are therefore a practical Exposition of the book. In preparing them the author's aim has been, first of all, to attract attention to the charming story of Ruth, and create an interest in it, and in the second place to raise in the minds of others "a feeling of high self respect, of unwavering faith in God, of cheerful hope in days of adversity, and of abiding conviction that true nobility of character, true piety and worth, may be found among those who tread the humble walks of life, as well as among

the more famed sons and daughters of men." The work is one which ought to have a wide circulation, and which can scarcely fail to inspire in those who read it a deeper sense of the beauty and blessedness of holy living.

ORDER OF SERVICE WITH THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, for use in the Sunday-school, the Catechetical Class and Church-Work Societies. Compiled and arranged by Rev. Nathaniel Z. Snyder, South Bethlehem, Pa. 1891. Price, 25 cents.

This is an admirable little book. It consists of the Heidelberg Catechism, a brief Catechism of the Church Year, Orders of Service for the different Sundays of the Church Year, and Prayers for special occasions. It is designed for use in the Sunday-school, and at stated meetings for Catechetical instruction. In its preparation a real want has been supplied. On account of its merits it ought to find a place in every Reformed Church Sunday-school. Its general use could scarcely fail to advance true spiritual knowledge and growth. We heartily commend it to the attention of the ministers and Sunday-school superintendents of the Reformed Church.

GENESIS I. AND MODERN SCIENCE. By Charles B. Warring, Ph.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price, \$1.00.

The object of this work is to show that the contents of the First Chapter of Genesis are in perfect accord with the established facts of Science, and that therefore it bears in itself evidence of being the work of one who exhaustively understood the import and the order of all phenomena, and from an infinite abundance selected those suited to his purpose. The argument is presented in the form of a discussion continued through nine evenings with a Professor of Natural Sciences. The book is well written, and gives evidence of considerable scholarship and ingenuity. Those interested in the subject to which it relates will find it deserving of attention.

OUR LORD'S LIFE. A Continuous Narrative in the Words of the Four Gospels according to the Common Version. Arranged by James Strong, S.T.D., LL.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price, 45 cents.

This Life of our Lord is substantially a condensation of the text of the author's *Harmony of the Gospels*, published in 1852, with such changes as were needed to adapt it to the present purpose. It gives, in regular chronological order, without omission or repetition, all the events and discourses of our Lord's life in the exact language of the sacred evangelists as found in the Authorized Version, and at the same time indicates the Gospel, by chapter and verse, from which each particular is derived. Besides a brief preface by the author, explaining the character of the work, it is also prefaced with a very full table of contents, a textual index, and tables of measures.

weights, time and winds, mentioned in the New Testament. The work is one of the very best of its kind, and will be found of real service in the study of Christ's life.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By John Wiley, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey, Vol. I. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892. Price \$3.00.

This volume forms part of the "Library of Biblical and Theological Literature," edited by George R. Crooks, D.D., and John F. Hurst, D.D. It is the Fifth Volume of the Series, and like those that have preceded it a work of superior merit. It is made up of an Introduction in which theology is defined, its source and scientific basis pointed out, and its systemization considered; and in three parts which treat respectively of Theism, Theology, and Anthropology. All these subjects are discussed in a clear, forcible and able manner. The work is especially deserving of attention as representing the present theological views of one of the largest and most influential Christian denominations of our country. We are sorry that our time and space will not permit us to give a fuller notice of the work. We may do so however in a future number of the Review.


A HEREDITARY CONSUMPTIVE'S SUCCESSFUL BATTLE FOR LIFE. By J. M. Buckley, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price: Paper 30 cents, Cloth 50 cents.

This essay, we are told in a preparatory note, consists of articles which appeared originally in "The Christian Advocate," and some additional matter of importance. It presents some very important facts and should be read by all who would maintain their health unimpaired, as well as by those who would obtain relief in pulmonary troubles. The principles underlying the treatise we believe to be sound ones.

THE CHURCH OF TO-MORROW. Addresses delivered in the United States and Canada during the autumn of 1891. By W. J. Dawson, author of "Makers of Modern English," "The Redemption of Edward Strahan," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892. Price \$1.00.

RELIGION FOR THE TIMES. By Lucian Clark, D.D., Assistant Editor of "The Christian Advocate." New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price \$1.25.

These volumes are of a popular character, designed to bring out the practical side of Christianity. The first one named aims to show the ethical element in Christianity as seen in its application to the personal and social wants of man. They contain good thought clothed in good style, and not too profound for reading in the warm months of a summer vacation.



THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 4.—OCTOBER 1892.

I.

THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM.

BY JOHN S. STAHR, D.D.

THERE is not a single mechanical or industrial process that has not felt the influence of the marvelous advance in scientific discovery for which our age is justly celebrated. There is not a single sphere or department of human life that has not been changed and enlarged by the application of new principles in the production and distribution of the things which satisfy human wants or minister to the well-being of man. In the cottage of the poor as well as in the mansion of the rich, in the simple surroundings of the peasant as well as in the complex organizations of city life are found the evidences and the fruit of an advanced civilization that furnishes for the support, the comfort, the amusement, the improvement of man means wrung from reluctant nature by the triumph of human skill and genius such as an earlier civilization could scarcely imagine in its wildest dreams. It is little wonder, therefore, that our educational means and methods should also have felt the influence of this spirit of progress. Indeed the changes which have

been effected in the external life of man, in his material surroundings, may be said to have sprung from the advancement in knowledge and experience which is characteristic of man as he develops in the unfolding of his historical life—that is, the life of the race. But progress in this respect consists not simply in the increase of knowledge by virtue of which new and surprising results are produced in the combination and use of the forces of nature. It affects the development of man's spiritual life as well as his relation to nature—not only the acquisition of knowledge, but also the unfolding of mind, the making of the man in the fulness of his powers. Investigation extends not only to the realm of matter, but also to that of mind; discoveries are made not only in the sphere of natural, but also in that of spiritual law; and in either case we find that every point of advantage gained by the enlargement of knowledge is immediately turned to practical account in the way of new methods and improved processes for the accomplishment of the same, or, it may be, more desirable ends. Accordingly we find a New Education, as well as a New Chemistry, and improved methods of teaching, as well as improved processes of tanning. All this is legitimate. There is no reason why a better knowledge of the laws of mind should not be as beneficial in education as the application of electricity is in the new French process of making leather.

Granting, without hesitation, that the age has advanced as rapidly in its intellectual as it has in its material development, there is still room for doubting many of the strong assertions which are made at the present time as to the great improvements effected in educational methods. Not all change is progress; and even where great advantages are gained in any department of human effort, the new order of things may be accompanied by features which prove great drawbacks in the proper adjustment of human relations. There is no doubt that the great improvements which have been made in manufacturing processes by the invention of machinery, the application of scientific discoveries, and the organization of labor in large in-

dustrial establishments have resulted in the cheapening of products so that the things which but a short time ago could be enjoyed only by the wealthy few, are now placed within the reach of persons of very moderate means. But it is not so certain that society as a whole is so much the better off; and it may be that the multiplication of machinery and the division of labor, so beneficial in one direction, have really wrought an injury to society by driving the small producer out of the market, breaking up the old-fashioned apprentice system, and in other ways changing the relations between man and man in a way which entails the loss of self-respect, independence, and concern for the welfare of others. So also in the sphere of education it is very evident that learning is more widely diffused, that the means of obtaining an education are within the reach of even the humblest, and that the field of knowledge has become so greatly enlarged by the intellectual progress of the age and the facilities for instruction so greatly improved by the princely liberality of the founders of colleges and universities, that there is the greatest possible contrast between the means and methods of the present day and those of fifty years ago. And yet there is room for asking the question whether, even if our schools are improved, our facilities multiplied, our attainments increased, and the results of our educational processes enlarged, there may not also be corresponding loss entailed upon us by the systems of which we are so proud. Do improved methods of instruction, better organized schools and training the fruit of which is immediately evident in practical results, necessarily make better MEN?

This question is not raised in a reactionary spirit or with a disposition to ignore or undervalue the advance of scientific thought and educational theory. No educated man, certainly, and especially no educator, can afford childishly to hug the delusion of pet theories or to cling with stubborn pertinacity to the stale traditions of the past simply because they are of the past. No institution of learning that aims to be worthy of the patronage of an intelligent public can afford to ignore the

scientific progress of the age, or fail to adopt the improved means of study and the better methods of teaching which the present day affords. It may be freely conceded that the institutions of higher learning which the present day requires, have a much larger problem to deal with than many of them seem to be aware of, and that where formerly a few thousands were supposed to be adequate for equipment and endowment, millions are now needed. It is no doubt still true that in education more depends on the men than on the means. A Mark Hopkins, a Woolsey or a Nevin wields more influence upon the growing mind than all the paraphernalia of college equipment combined. But such men are rare, and even they do not drop from the sky. They are formed by the educational system of their day, and they need adequate means to work with. To suppose, because now and then there is an educator whose power and influence are so striking that every ordinary appliance in the way of building and apparatus sinks into insignificance, that therefore college and university endowments are not needed, is a piece of egregious folly. The argument that a Mark Hopkins makes a university, does well enough when it is important to emphasize the influence of the man in education, but it is pernicious as well as false when it is used as an apology for ignorance, indolence or parsimony. Whatever reason there may be for questioning some of the tendencies of the present day in the field of education, there is no occasion for looking back to the past with regret, or "sighing for the fleshpots of Egypt," even if it is to be feared that we are still wandering in the wilderness and the "promised land" is not yet in view.

It is not the purpose of the present paper to set forth the shortcomings of the educational systems of the day, and to sound a note of retreat to the ground occupied by our fathers and grandfathers, nor to weep over the treasure expended in the endowment of large institutions of learning, because "the ointment might have been sold for two hundred pence and given to the poor." It is proposed rather to make a candid

inquiry into the present drift of thought and practice to see whether, with all the advantages which the present generation enjoys, there is not also serious loss, and that of a kind that will entail a very damaging train of evils upon the coming generation unless these features of our educational development can be modified, and the current turned in a different direction. At the same time, if there is room for criticising some things in the educational policy of the present, it may not be out of place to call attention to the good features of the earlier system, and especially to emphasize the advantages offered by the old-fashioned Denominational College, which has come to us as a precious inheritance from the days of our fathers.

In the American educational system the college holds the central place. Whether by design or accident such is really the case, and it gives our system a somewhat different organization from that of any other country. This fact has been recognized by those who have made educational systems their special study, and only recently a graduate of one of the German universities compared the German system with the American to the disadvantage of the former; not because the work done is in any way inferior, or that there is a lack of thoroughness, but simply because *Germany has no institution of learning that stands for culture pure and simple*. In America we are justly proud of our public schools, and our universities are growing with marvelous rapidity. We have no fault to find with the efforts made to advance either the one or the other to the highest possible degree of efficiency. The alarming feature of the case is that the importance of the college is overlooked so that the tendency is to degrade it to the level of the high school, or exalt it to the grade of the university. Between the two there is danger that the real flavor of culture will be lost; that its delicious aroma will be expelled and replaced by a taste strongly commercial. This can be best shown by inquiring a little more closely into the history and present status of the American College.

Such an inquiry may be conducted upon two different lines. We may start from the theoretical or pedagogic standpoint, discuss the different stages of the educational process, and determine in this way the proper scope of the college; or, again, we may begin on the practical side, study the college in its genesis and development and thus learn its present status. It might seem as if these two lines diverged very widely, inasmuch as the college as we find it in its historical development is by no means all that it ought to be on theoretical grounds. But the difference is not as great as might be expected. The forces and influences which have been operative historically have been modified in their action by theoretical considerations, so that in the concrete the college after all fairly approximates its ideal. Indeed, if we have any faith in history as a movement out of chaos into order, out of darkness into the light, we shall be able to find evidences of a progressive movement in the growth of the college towards its ideal. The earth is an oblate spheroid, and its shape is accounted for on the supposition that it was at one time a liquid or yielding body which, as it revolved on its axis, necessarily assumed this form. But it has also been shown that a body as hard and rigid as the earth now is, rotating on its axis, and undergoing disintegration on the surface by the action of air and water, would by a series of slow and imperceptible changes, though at first a perfect sphere, gradually become an oblate spheroid. There would be a constant movement of material on the surface towards the equator until equilibrium was established. Institutions of learning, we think, are subject to a similar process of evolution. Not every change is for the better; but there are leveling and adjusting agencies, as well as those that disturb the equilibrium. Influences hostile to the development of the ideal college may change the current of its life; but we have reason to believe that the requirements of sound culture and liberal education will always in the end assert themselves.

The American college, as to its origin and history, is a unique institution. As already intimated, it differs in many

respects from the institutions of learning found in Europe. Although it is named after and resembles in many of its features the college of the English University, it also had from the beginning some of the functions of the University, such as, for instance, the power to confer degrees. Its founders freely determined its functions according to the needs of the hour, and gave it a character in accordance with the historical conditions by which it was surrounded.

It is worthy of remark that, although at the present time the tendency is to establish institutions of learning independently of Church control, and to reduce to a minimum such control in those already established, the first impulse to establish institutions of higher learning in this country proceeded from the bosom of the Christian Church. Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, the College of New Jersey, Amherst, indeed nearly all the colleges and universities of the country whose roots have struck deep into the soil of our national life, came into existence in response to a demand for liberally educated men. This need was most urgently felt in the holy ministry, but there was a call for such men everywhere in what are called the learned professions and the higher walks of life. As in the development of European civilization, the Church did not, as is sometimes charged, repress the cultivation of letters, but on the contrary planted the seeds of culture in the wilderness, in monasteries and schools established by the Church, so in this country, by the same influence, there were planted and nurtured colleges and universities, the influence of which went far to lay the very foundations of our civilization. In both cases, through these agencies, the benign influences of learning were diffused among the people as thistle-down is carried over the fields by the autumn winds. This was the case also, as is well known, in the Reformed Church. As soon as our fathers came to their self-consciousness as a religious denomination, they established first our Theological Seminary, and this, by bringing home to the consciousness of the Church the necessity of a liberal education and a broad culture as an indispensable

condition for the study of theology, carried in its train the establishment of Marshall College at Mercersburg, the oldest college of the Reformed Church. It is not to be supposed that in the establishment of such a college the purpose was simply to provide the preliminary training without which a candidate for the ministry could not properly prepare himself for his holy calling. It is to the credit of our fathers that they had the wisdom to discern the importance of liberal culture in all ranks of life *as essential to the making of every man* who was to wield a far-reaching influence in the community, or become the successful aspirant for professional honors. Accordingly while the Church, through the generosity of far-seeing, liberal-hearted men, provided for the education of her ministers, she also furnished the means in her college for the training in liberal learning of all who came to her halls, and these, whether in professional life, or business, or the council halls of the nation, became the moulders of thought and the leaders of society in the best sense of the word.

The course of study in the institutions of learning or colleges which were thus established was at first very elementary. Harvard did not offer more than an ordinary High School. But the standard was gradually raised and the scope of instruction enlarged. So in the other colleges. Changes in the curriculum and additions were made according to the surrounding conditions and the needs of the students, under the controlling influence of the pedagogic principles held by those who had the direction of affairs in their hands. But in all cases a distinction was steadily kept in view between the proper work of the college as expressed by the phrase "liberal culture," and technical or professional studies which were taken up after the completion of the undergraduate course and the attainment of the degree of A. B. Very early, however, professional schools became associated with the colleges (in some cases they even preceded them), and thus there was in many cases a gradual enlargement into a university. This ambition to become a university has sometimes had a beneficial effect, but very often the

opposite. As in manufacturing establishments there is economy in the use of power, as well as in the working up of material and the gradation of labor in the case of large plants or the association of several manufactories which use each other's products, so there is inspiration and enthusiasm, a large measure of mutual help and the possibility of using time to better advantage in the association of intellectual workers of different kinds and the union of different schools under one organization as a university. But there is danger also that the distinction between the college proper and the technical school will be lost sight of, and that the peculiar work of the college will be encroached upon and dwarfed. The effect is still worse when colleges assume the name and play the role of a university by multiplying courses of study upon paper, such as Book-keeping, Type-writing, Music, Painting, etc., without the means or equipment to prosecute effectively the advanced courses which really belong to the university. Very often, to secure patronage by catering to the impatient, utilitarian, mercenary spirit of the age, courses are established which run parallel with the courses in the liberal arts, which, in so far as they include technical studies, displace or interfere with the discipline which the genuine college ought to give, and are therefore a source of weakness rather than of strength. The arrangement of studies in courses has a great deal in its favor; but whenever it serves to set aside real discipline, and substitute technical skill for culture, its consequences must be disastrous.

If by education we mean the *making of the man*, it is, in the wide sense of the word, a life work. But we usually make a distinction between the fitting of a man for his work and his subsequent career. The formation of character is begun in the former, but it continues in the latter until the hidden genius of the man is brought to view and perfected. Education, therefore, is properly speaking such a training of a man's powers as will enable him to use every talent to the best advantage and make every incident of life minister, not to the acquisition of wealth, the conquest of nature, the gaining of preëminence

among his fellows, but to the perfection of his own being and the advancement of the race. This may sound chimerical or antiquated. But it includes everything else; and even what the world calls success is bound up with the realization of this lofty ideal. Let this be lost sight of, and the dearest interests of life must perish; let this be realized, and life will yield not only "sweetness and light," but also the highest order of mental power, the widest grasp of knowledge, the richest measure of material prosperity. For the path by which such an end is reached lies not above the clouds, but immediately before us. Daily contact with the world and the struggles of practical life are the conditions, laid down by God Himself, by means of which our powers are perfected. But these are the means only. The cause lies higher. Happy he, who enters upon life with a lofty ideal and whose toil is ennobled by the consciousness that the victor is greater than the victory, because the victor is the embodiment of that by which the victory was made possible.

If now we look at the process by which a man is fitted for his work, we find that it consists of three easily distinguished parts. The whole process rests upon two fundamental principles: First, *that all growth, physical, intellectual and moral, results from the exercise of faculty.* Secondly, *that every exercise of a faculty exerts a reflex influence, and the impression made by it persists in the mind.* If the mind is to grow, therefore, it must be active, not passive; and as it acts, so will it be. It is the principal, if not the only merit of the new education that it recognizes this truth and seeks to make the child an inquirer or investigator from the beginning—a learner not simply by the exercise of memory, but by the use of every power upon its appropriate object. First of all we have elementary instruction, which includes the training of the senses, the acquisition of knowledge by their use, and the mastery of the rudiments of learning. In this way the door that communicates between the world within and the world without is opened. This is the work of the elementary school including the high school and academy. It ought to furnish both discipline to the mind and

knowledge of the world such as all men ought to have in every condition of life. What this ought to include can be readily seen by a reference to Dr. Dwight's excellent paper on "Education in Boyhood."

Taking this for granted, it is very evident that beyond this there must be a process of special training by which a man is fitted for his particular calling. It may be received in the workshop or the counting-house, in the technical school or the university; but if the calling requires skilled labor or professional knowledge, some special training there must be. Without it the most brilliant man is only a quack.

These, now, are the two extremes of the educational process, and between them lies the true sphere of the college. The universal experience of educators on the one hand and of practical life on the other proves that an elementary education is an inadequate preparation for professional studies or the development of a man's powers to the degree required for the highest order of success. Room must be made for *higher education*, a process which not only enlarges the field of knowledge and strengthens the mental powers in the farther prosecution of study, but also enlarges and liberalizes the mind and gives it power to survey the world from a higher point of view. There is the same difference in the appearance of the world to an uneducated and an educated man, as there is between the appearance of a landscape under the shadow of the clouds and its appearance when illuminated by the sun. It is the office of the college, therefore, to furnish the mind with knowledge, to discipline and cultivate, to exalt and glorify every power of body and soul, to make the educated man, to impart that indefinable something which is the mark at once of strength and of enlarged freedom of soul.

We have said that the so-called new education lays stress on the mind's activity upon its appropriate objects. It begins right, but just here it also frequently becomes one-sided and defective in that it does not recognize the necessity of a higher development in which the mind's action is none the less real,

but the object is no longer without but within the mind; that is, the mind must learn to contemplate truth, not only in its concrete or outward expression, but also in its abstract or spiritual relations. There are deeper relations than those of external things; there are general truths and principles which the mind must also learn to grasp before it can be fully free. In other words, in the process of liberal education the mind must be *unsensed* just as in moral culture it must be unselfed, and higher education must lead to this result.

This is the special province of the college. Its culture must be broad and liberal, including the discipline of every faculty and the traversing of every field of knowledge. The university, on the contrary, although it carries its investigations much farther, and therefore seems, at first sight, to offer much more to the student, really contracts the field to the individual learner, and its discipline is accordingly narrow and special. We find no fault with this, certainly, *if such teaching is preceded by a broad and liberal culture*; but it cannot, with safety, be substituted for the training which the college ought to give. It is the college that leads the mind into universal truth—truth as it lies before us in the constitution of nature, truth as it is written upon the human heart and comes to view in speech and action, truth as it is embodied in the constitution of man's religious nature seeking for the light of divine revelation. And in the apprehension of such many-sided truth, the mind becomes enlarged and free.

In this whole process growth is by the exercise of faculty. There is not a discipline in the whole curriculum of study that does not mean real work and contact with living truth. It has been charged that in the college the mind is fed upon husks instead of real knowledge. But, certainly, there is no force in the charge, unless the teacher has mistaken his calling. Our contention is that the real teacher is also an inquirer, and he leads his pupil to the acquisition of knowledge by the use of his own powers, and whether the subject matter be language or history or chemistry or algebra, both teacher

and pupil are investigating, and this process leads to the living truth.

Such education includes the training of the body. The legitimate practice of athletics not only serves to keep the body in good condition, but it also strengthens it. It not only opens a harmless way for the escape of surplus energy, but it also imparts discipline of a high order. At the same time it is to be borne in mind that the body is a means only, the servant of the soul. To cultivate it for its own sake, and to regard physical strength as heroic is worse than folly, because it is a perversion of the gifts of God. The body is the medium only through which the mind acts, and its perfection is to be sought for in order that it may be a perfect medium. The cultivation of the mind, for its own sake, must therefore be the central feature of all college discipline, as we have already described it. It is important to add, however, that even this, in itself, would be imperfect if it did not rest upon and proceed from a moral and religious basis. A colorless education which sets aside religion and concerns itself only with the study of the different branches of learning is not possible, because it either assumes a form which is hostile to religion, or else it is confessedly imperfect, and cannot stand as the training of the whole man.

The late Bishop Bowman well said at the inauguration of the first president of Franklin and Marshall College: "The education which you here propose to impart is to be a sanctified education, education refined, and elevated by religious influence. You, Mr. President, allow me to say, and the gentlemen associated with you, have no legitimate place in a seminary of education, except as along with the seeds of human learning, you aim to implant also the infinitely more important truths of revealed religion. Nor need the best friend of this institution care how soon it perishes down to its foundation stone, when Christian voices cease to be heard and Christian influences to prevail in it."

This theory of college education, as briefly set forth, is

threatened with danger from two different sides. We have already said that the American college is a unique institution. It is not the full equivalent of the German *gymnasium*, for it goes beyond the latter in its curriculum of studies. It is not on the same plane as the universities of the Old World, for its work is not special, but of a general character. It includes the pure discipline of the *gymnasium* with the addition, in the higher classes, of certain university studies.

The first source of danger is from the practical side. The age in which we live is one of rapid development, and has but little patience with the cumbersome methods of former days. The haste which is everywhere manifest in our American life also makes its influence felt in our educational systems, and demands a shortening of the course of study or the period of preparation for active life, and on all sides we see the evidences of unrest and eagerness to leap over barriers into a practical career. Hence the effort is made either to shorten the college course, as for instance, to allow the work of four years to be crowded into three, or else to introduce technical or professional studies into the college course at the expense of other necessary means of culture or discipline. Either method will work serious harm unless it is possible to secure better preparation for the proper discipline of the college, and thus leave room for more and better work on the part of the student.

On the other hand there is danger that, looking at the subject from the purely theoretical standpoint, injustice may be done by a too rigid adherence to the old course of study, or a failure to adapt the course to changed conditions resulting from improved methods of work, the enlargement of the field of knowledge, or new demands made upon our institutions of learning by the progress of society.

A college that deserves the name must have a theory of education, and maintain its principles, if need be, in the face of opposition from any quarter. It cannot sell its educational birthright for the mess of pottage of popular applause. But neither can it stand aloof from the current of life that sur-

rounds it or the thought of the age in which it lives. It must be in living, loving sympathy with all that is best and most progressive in the theory and method of educational thought, and thus bring its power to bear in shaping the educational movements of the day, while at the same time it is open to every legitimate influence that comes back to it from its surroundings.

While, therefore, it is our firm conviction that the college is a means for thorough liberal culture, we believe at the same time that the end in view does not require absolute and rigid uniformity. At the outset, so far as a course of liberal study is concerned, all begin in the same way and pursue the same branches of study, and these, in the nature of the case, are prescribed by the college authorities, not chosen by the students. Here there is no room for question or doubt. But it does not follow for this reason that the same rigid uniformity must be maintained throughout. For, in the first place, the minds which undergo this process of discipline are not all alike, and when, as they become more mature, the differences of taste and capacity become manifest, it is by no means clear that better results cannot be reached by allowing some room for choice, or at least a difference of allotted work in the latter part of the course. Again, the field of knowledge in these days has become so extensive that it is by no means as easy as formerly to give it a general survey, while the demands of the different professions have increased to such an extent that, while training in the college ought still to be for discipline and general culture, it seems desirable that it should include now more here, now more there, with a view to adequate preparation for the special line of work to be pursued afterward.

Even the more conservative colleges of the country, like Yale and Princeton, recognize these facts, and make room for elective studies in the latter part of their course. This does not mean the elimination of any study or discipline that now belongs to the course; it simply means a certain range of variety in each, a maximum and a minimum of work required

or allowed in every department to satisfy what may be regarded the necessities of each individual case. Putting the aspirants for entrance into the different professions or avocations upon the same level, assuring to each a generous liberal culture, and recognizing the natural differences between minds in taste and capacity, such a system would open the way for the solution of many a perplexing problem, and in education, as in Christianity, there would be neither male nor female, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.

II.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

BY THE REV. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

THIS subject is one of equal importance and difficulty. On the one hand it touches the foundation. For among the earliest questions in theology is the Rule of Faith, and nothing can be decided respecting doctrine or practice until we have reached a final authoritative standard of truth. Such a standard all the reformed churches declare to be given in the Old Testament and the New. But if this position is to be maintained, it must be shown that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and that not figuratively nor vaguely, but in such sense as justly to carry upon them the whole weight of the Infinite Mind. Anything short of this involves the entire subject in confusion and complexity. If the standard be not fixed, how can we possibly know what we apply to it? Whatever importance, therefore, attaches to the Rule of Faith—confessedly a fundamental point—equally attaches to the question of Inspiration. On the other hand, the subject is peculiarly difficult. For while all Christians acknowledge the Bible to be the word of God, yet even we go beneath the surface and ask in what sense it is the word of God or inspired, the answers vary widely, and indeed ways have varied, even among those altogether agreed on other points. Nor do we get any aid from the Creeds and confessions of old, those precious symbols in which the faithful experience of former generations are formulated. While these all imply more or less distinctly a plenary inspiration, they do not directly express it. No definitions are on record; none in the dogmatic expositions which sprang up in the second

century of the Reformation, there are no essays which would be generally accepted now as precise and adequate statement of the doctrine. Nay, more; in works which were current thirty or forty years ago, there are positions taken and distinctions made which are generally, if not universally, disowned among scholars at the present day.

The difficulties of the subject may be seen from two works of the present generation. In the "*Aids to Faith*," published in 1861, as a reply to the famous *Essays and Reviews*, the paper on this subject, contributed by no less a man than Harold Browne, the late bishop of Winchester, says distinctly, "It seems pretty generally agreed among thoughtful men at present that definite theories of inspiration are doubtful and dangerous." So in the lectures on the evidences of Christianity, delivered before the Union Theological Seminary in New York in 1867 by Rev. A. Barnes, occurs this passage: "I said that there are great questions about inspiration which are yet unsettled. I repeat, on account of its importance, and with the hope of stirring up some young man of this seminary to the task, the remark I have already made, that in my judgment there is no one department of Christian literature to which a young man could better devote himself than the solution of those questions. They are beyond my range now, beyond my learning, my ability, and I should not attempt to enter upon them. What is inspiration at all? What is plenary inspiration? Is it suggestion, or superintendence, or control, or all combined? In inspiration how far are the faculties of the men themselves employed? Were they kept from error on all subjects? In what sense was what they wrote on common matter inspired? To what extent in the Book is the Spirit of God 'responsible' for the statements made? And how can the dates, and the genealogies, and the apparent inconsistencies and contradictions, be reconciled with the proper idea of inspiration? These are questions in many of their bearings yet to be solved, and happy will be the man who shall be raised up to solve them." Notwithstanding these discouraging statements,

it may be possible to render some aid toward the attainment of definite views on the entire subject.

I. WHAT IS PRESUPPOSED. That the Scriptures are genuine and authentic, *i. e.*, credible historical documents. For we prove the inspiration by the credibility, and not the latter by the former. The great buttresses of the credibility of the Scriptures are the external evidences of miracle and prophecy; the internal, consisting in the majesty, harmony, originality and purity of their contents; and the experimental, as shown by their adaptedness to all the spiritual wants of man's nature. Any candid consideration of these lines of argument must lead to the conviction that the Bible is neither a forgery nor a myth, but a true, trustworthy book. Further, its component parts are supposed to be ascertained, *i. e.*, that it consists of certain writings and no more. In other words its canonical authority is established. The Bible consists of the 39 books of the Old Testament and the 27 of the New; and the entire discussion is confined to them and to them only. The question is, are these writings inspired of God, and if so, in what sense? The gist of the inquiry lies in the latter clause.

II. SOURCE OF OUR KNOWLEDGE. This is the Scriptures themselves. Whether we could ascertain the fact of their inspiration without their own testimony on the point, is, to say the least, very doubtful. Certain it is we are not shut up to such inferential reasoning, but have the most abundant assertions of a divine origin all through the sacred volume.

It is not necessary to quote in detail the affirmations of the Old Testament as to its own origin, for that ground is fully covered by the precise statements of the New. Our Saviour appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures as containing the words of eternal life, and sanctioned them all as arranged by the Jews in the three-fold division of the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, and again and again quoted them as the express word of God. The Apostle Paul declared that all Scripture was given by inspiration of God. And it will make no difference if we adopt the view taken by the authors of the Revised Ver-

sion and transfer *theopneustos* from the predicate to the subject, and read "every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable, etc." for in this case the affirmation is equally strong that the Bible is divinely inspired.

So the Apostle Peter says that "no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation, (i. e. origin), but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." These passages are conclusive as to the Old Testament, but surely the preparatory part of the Bible would not be inspired, and its complement left without such a guarantee. Accordingly we find ample provision made for it. Our Lord promised to the Apostles, the Holy Spirit to "guide them into all the truth, to teach them all things, and to bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them." They claim to have received just this influence—Paul saying (1 Cor. ii. 13), "Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," and John saying: "We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us, he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." Similar is the whole tone of the New Testament. Yet there is one apparent exception—in 1 Cor. vii. 12, where Paul says, "To the rest speak I, not the Lord"—where some foolishly suppose the Apostle distinguishes between what is inspired and what is not, whereas the connection shows that he distinguishes only between what the Lord had taught while on earth, and what Paul was now inspired by the Holy Spirit to teach. On the general subject of marriage Christ had spoken, and therefore Paul cites his words (in vs. 10, 11); but as to mixed marriages (between Christian and heathen) the Saviour had not laid down any rule, and therefore the Apostle gives a direction in his own words as taught from heaven. So that the passage, instead of weakening, rather confirms the doctrine of the Apostles' Inspiration—inasmuch as it puts their utterances on a par with those of their Master.

III. THE REAL QUESTION.—Here then we come face to face with the real question. All who are in any sense Christians

acknowledge the fact of Inspiration, but in what sense, to what extent, under what limitations, and how is the truth to be stated? The reason of these inquiries is obvious. For the Bible is the book of man as well as of God. A small part of it—the ten words—was once written by a Divine finger on the tables of stone, but all the rest has come to us through human agency. “*Holy men of God spake as they were moved.*” There is then both a divine and a human element in it—but in what proportions? Where are we to run the boundary line between these two factors? How shall we avoid sacrificing one to the other? How shall we frame a theory which will give each its due place and importance, and yet meet all the facts in the case? Before attempting an answer to these queries, it is best to look at the course of opinion in the past.

The Jewish Church held the highest possible doctrine on the subject. The Rabbins believed not only in the direct suggestion by God of every verse and word, but even that a mystery lurked in every abnormal state of letter, jot or tittle. This view stripped of Rabbinical refinements passed into the Christian Church, and was held by nearly all the Fathers. Clement and Origen clearly assert a verbal inspiration, and Chrysostom and Jerome, although more critical in their attainments, and more conscious of the presence of the human element, were yet firmly persuaded of the agency of a controlling Spirit. Nor does this doctrine seem to have been questioned until the age of Abelard, whose adventurous spirit swerved from the common faith here as in other deep questions of Theology. And after him the prevalence of mysticism—an ecstatic vision of things—to which the state of the times offered a strong temptation, naturally led those who gave way to it, to overlook the distinction between the inspiration of Apostles and the enlightenment of the Christian soul. Still no definite theory was propounded, and other questions absorbed the general interest.

All this changed at the epoch of the Reformation. The question then came into the foreground where it has ever since remained. Here we find the two tendencies at work under

which may be conveniently arranged all the varying shades of opinion on the subject. These are the exaggeration on one hand of the divine side, and on the other of the human side, of the doctrine of inspiration.

IV. EXAGGERATION OF THE DIVINE ELEMENT.—Naturally we observe in the first instance a disposition to dwell unduly on the Bible as a work of God. It could not well be otherwise. The Reformers, rejecting the Romish theory of the infallibility of the church, were compelled to find some other depository of infallibility, and they fell back on the Scriptures as the unerring arbiter of truth, and as alone sufficient for salvation. This indeed very soon became the watchword of the entire movement. Thus they were led to emphasize in the strongest manner the whole word of God as an immediate utterance of divine inspiration. This was often stated as if the several writers of Scripture were nothing more than the penmen of the Divine Spirit, under whose control, they vibrated as the strings of a harp in the hands of an artist. They were just like a piece of mechanism touched by God Himself. An external mechanical force suspended the independent play of the inspired man's faculties, and he was a passive instrument, or at least a mere vehicle of a higher power.* This theory was very variously expressed by different writers, but in general it maintained that each and every word in the Scripture, and the order and arrangement of the words, had been supplied and dictated by the Holy Ghost. But this external view is liable to many objections.

(1) It makes *no allowance for the individuality* of the sacred writers. Nothing is more evident than that they spoke and wrote, each according to his language, country, age, character, training, associations and pursuits. Any two of them differ just as much in these respects as any two authors who lay no

* Even Augustine said, "We cannot say that Christ wrote nothing, since the Apostles were merely His hands in writing," (Smith, H. B.) and one of the Reformers, that the "Sacred writers were not the penmen, but the pen of the Holy Ghost."

claim to inspiration. Who can be more unlike than Job and Solomon, or Isaiah and Jeremiah, or Paul and James, or Peter and John? The differences here are original and wide, and no view of the subject which denies or ignores them can be admitted. They cannot be explained by the differences in the sound of a musical instrument according to the skill or purpose of those who play on it. For here the diversities are plainly in the men themselves. They existed before they were inspired and remained afterwards. Besides, there is in many cases the most distinct exhibition of the personality and consciousness of these men, *e.g.*, in the private experiences given in the Psalms, and in the Epistles. It is vain to think of regarding these as created for the occasion by a power standing outside of the writers. We feel instinctively that they must have sprung from the circumstances in which the writers were placed, and are the natural actings of their own minds.

(2) Another difficulty in the way of this theory is that it *necessarily attributes to God what we know He abhors, e.g.*, the lies that Satan told to Eve, the cruel misrepresentations of Job which were made by his friends, the objections stated for refutation in Ecclesiastes, and in the argumentative Epistles of Paul. All these are in Scripture and a part of Scripture, and very important to be known, but they ought not to be and cannot be called the immediate utterances of God. And any theory which makes them such, however it may design to save the divine honor, does in reality expose it to the most serious reproach.

(3) Another objection is that this view makes all Scripture, not only instructive and useful which is the truth, but also all *instructive and useful in the same manner and to an equal degree*, which is very far from being true. The genealogies in I. Chronicles serve a very important purpose, but they are not to be compared in value with the Sermon on the Mount. The moral maxims of Solomon are a great storehouse of practical wisdom, yet they fall far below the sublimity and pathos of the evangelical prophet. The biographies in the Old Testament are full

of instruction, yet all of them together do not equal the one great biography which opens the New Testament. Manifestly our theory of inspiration must be one that will allow for these diversities in importance.

These and like difficulties were early seen to burden the doctrine which makes everything of the Divine factor and nothing of the human. There was therefore a reaction in the opposite direction.

V. EXAGGERATION OF THE HUMAN SIDE.—This began among the Socinians and Arminians of the 17th century, but soon extended far beyond them. The general ground assumed here is that the Scriptures do indeed contain a revelation from God and so far are inspired, but the writers, being human and imperfect, were liable to error and in fact did err. This was stated in different ways.

(1) One ground taken was that the *religious teachings were truly God's utterances*, but the narrative portions were the product of men's own powers and studies, and that these must very naturally be subject to mistake. A distinction very like that of the Romish doctors in regard to the Pope's infallibility. He cannot err in questions of faith or morals, but as to matters of fact or science he is fallible as other men. But, however this may answer for the claims of his Holiness, it fails entirely in the question we are considering. In the Scripture the dogmatic and historical statements are inextricably interwoven with each other, and must stand or fall together. For example, the fall of the first man and the consequent depravity of the race is a fact as well as a doctrine, and the rejection of the former logically implies that of the latter. If the account of what occurred in Eden is a myth, the Scripture view of sin is sadly mutilated or rather utterly disjointed. So in reference to the person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. The stupendous doctrine of the Incarnation is a historical fact, stated with utmost precision as to time, place and circumstances. If there be error in the narrative, there must be equal error in the theological views founded upon it or identified with it. But in

truth what intelligent basis can there be for this distinction between directly religious and other teachings? If the writers were correct in announcing heavenly things, would they not *a fortiori* be correct in relating earthly things? Why should they be infallible in the more important and difficult matters and exposed to error in the easier and more ordinary?

(2) Another escape from difficulties has been devised in the theory that *only the thoughts of revelation are inspired*, but the shaping and clothing of them in words has been left to the human agents employed. This seems to be founded upon a confusion between revelation and inspiration which will hereafter be noticed. The Scripture is the record of a revelation from God. How can a record be made without words? It is not necessary here to take the extreme ground of some, and say that there can be no thought without language. The cases of infant children and of deaf mutes sufficiently disprove any such hypothesis. Nay indeed so far from thought depending upon words, it often quite outstrips them, as when the Apostle speaks of groanings which cannot be uttered, or of a gift or a joy which is unspeakable. But when the question respects not the exercise, but the communication of thought, the case is altered. How are we to know the thoughts of another except by the language in which they are clothed?

Those thoughts obtain all their precision, definiteness and clearness, from the verbal statements in which they are conveyed. Hence in all true and just writing the thought and the word are wedded together indissolubly as the soul and body in human nature. Surely such is the fact in all the great masterpieces of poetry, oratory and philosophy. How will you separate Milton's conceptions from his dialect even if Johnson did call it "Babylonish," or the rush of Demosthenes's eloquence from the winged words which uttered it?

The Scriptures themselves know nothing of this severance between the conceptions and the expression of inspiration. They speak always of the words of God. They quote and argue from them, sometimes even for a single word—as in the

case of a singular noun instead of a plural in Gal. iii. 10. Nor indeed do they ever speak of the thoughts, or sentiments or doctrines of the Scripture, separately from the language. It is the writings themselves to which the inspiration attaches. Indeed, on any other theory, we should need an additional revelation to guide us in discerning how much of the Old Bible is divine thought, and how much human word. But in truth, Inspiration is the organizing principle of the whole book, just as life is the organizing energy in the bodily frame, extending to the brains of the head as well as to the beating of the heart. It comprises both the matter and the form; the matter in the form in which it is conveyed and set forth. It extends to the language, not in any mechanical sense, but in the sense that, under divine guidance, each writer spake in his own language according to the measure of his knowledge, however acquired. All spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Thus that blessed Spirit works in all parts of the Bible, making out of its many and varied elements one divine work, God's book, given by men and for men.

3. The most prevalent form in our day of exaggerating the human element in Inspiration, is that of making it a *purely subjective process*.

This tendency first appeared in the mystics of the Middle Ages. It is a natural result of the belief in an ecstatic vision of things divine in which constant revelations are made to the soul. This is essentially different from the common doctrine that the Holy Ghost dwells in and with the Church to enlighten and instruct and guide humble believers. It is one thing to enable us to understand and appropriate revealed truth already existing, and another to make to us fresh disclosures in new directions. This latter was the error of the mystic. He thought he was transported out of himself and had supernatural communion with God. His soul therefore was in a condition of constant inspiration. The intuitions of his spirit enabled him to see things invisible. Of course then he was in no respect less favored than the penmen of the Scriptures, and

their inspiration was no more than his own, viz., a certain vivid illumination of the devout mind.

Mysticism reappeared after the Reformation, in the Anabaptists, the Quakers and others, and with much the same result. The mystic has an infallible guide in his own bosom who not only opens his understanding that he may understand the Scripture, but communicates truth sensibly and directly to the soul. Thus *e. g.* the leading principle of George Fox and the early Friends was the doctrine of the Inward Light common to every man. This they claimed to be the true principle of all religious knowledge. Every thing else must be subordinated to the light of God within the soul. Even the outward word was valuable chiefly as it stirred up the word within. Manifestly on this view there is no distinction between the inspiration of prophets and apostles, and that of every true believer. The orthodox Quakers have long since quietly dropped this extreme view.

The same point was reached in a different way by the celebrated *Schleiermacher*, whose influence over his own and the succeeding generation was so marked. His view of inspiration was the direct corollary of his fundamental principle—that there was no immediate intervention of God in the history of the world, save in two instances: one the creation of man; the other, the constitution of the person of Christ. This of course takes all the supernatural out of the Bible. The Old Testament had nothing which the nature derived from Adam was not able to produce, and the New had nothing which the life common to all believers was not sufficient to account for. Christianity in his view was not a doctrine but a life. In the incarnation God did not take upon Him a true body and a reasonable soul, but generic humanity. The effect was to unite the human and divine as one life. And this life passes over to the Church by a process of natural development, just as Adam's life did to his descendants. Participation of this divine-human life makes a man a Christian.

Now the men who, at the time of Christ's appearance upon

earth, came most directly under His influence, enjoyed a peculiar elevation of the religious consciousness. This subjective state, this excitement of a higher life, gave them intuitions of religious truth, eternal verities. And these intuitions were afterward clothed in the form of doctrines. And this is what is meant and all that is meant by inspiration.

The influence of Schleiermacher was felt by Coleridge, whose opinions, suggested in his earlier writings, were distinctly set forth in a posthumous work, "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," marked with all his splendor of diction and looseness of thought. The treatise is a glowing protest against the mechanical theory of inspiration which he represents as the prevailing view, viz., "That all that exists in the sacred volume was not alone composed by men under the actuating influence of the Holy Spirit, but likewise dictated by an infallible intelligence," and again, that "all the nominal composers of the Hebrew nation before the time of Ezra, of whom there are any remains, were successively transformed into automatic compositors—so that the original text should be in sentiment, image, word, syntax and composition, an exact impression of the divine copy." Coleridge rings the changes on these views in every possible form, and then in his recoil falls back upon a theory hardly more rational. In his pet phrase: "In the Bible there is more that finds me than I have experienced in all other books put together; the words of the Bible find me at greater depths of my being; and whatever finds me brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit." But what as to such portions as do not *find* him? He nowhere expressly says that such portions are not inspired, but his whole discussion implies it. So that we are thrown back simply upon our own individual consciousness. Whatever in Scripture meets our individual wants is from God in the proper sense—whatever does not, is merely the result of His providential direction, and comes to us with no authority at all. A looser or more worthless theory could hardly be devised. It strips the Bible of its claim to be an unerring rule of faith, and makes every man's

consciousness the test of truth. Or, as the Bishop of Winchester says: "If we go on this principle where are we to stop? If we read the Second book of Chronicles perhaps we may discover very little which 'finds' us; whereas if we read Baxter's *Saints' Rest*, it may find us in nearly every page. To carry out Coleridge's principle, we ought to uncanonize or reject as inspired the book of Chronicles, and set up as canonical and inspired the book of Baxter."

The prevalent English application of Schleiermacher's views may be stated in this way. God made a revelation of Himself to the world in Jesus Christ, but it was the inspiration of the Apostles which enabled them clearly to discern it. The proper idea of this inspiration, however, does not include either miraculous powers, verbal dictation, or any distinct commission from God. "It does not imply anything generically new in the actual processes of the human mind, nor does it involve any form of intelligence essentially different from what we already possess. It indicates rather the elevation of the religious consciousness, and with it, of course, the power of spiritual vision, to a degree of intensity peculiar to the individuals thus highly favored of God." Thus in any and every case in which the moral nature is highly purified, and the spiritual being is brought into harmony with the mind of God, there is nothing to prevent or disturb the immediate intuition of divine things. The theory is one which is calculated to mislead, because it carefully preserves much of the phraseology of Scripture, while yet in reality it overthrows the whole foundation of the Gospel.

The objections to it are :

1. Its *misconception of Religion*. The theory makes religion to consist in feeling—the feeling of absolute dependence, *i. e.*, the consciousness that the finite is nothing in the presence of the Infinite. All forms, therefore, of this emotion are alike true, although not equally pure, nor equally adequate in their modes of expression. The worship of Baal and the worship of Jehovah were substantially the same thing, differing in acci-

dents and manifestation, but not in root and essence. The Bible is totally opposed to this. It everywhere assumes that there can be no holiness without truth. It traces the idolatry and immorality of the heathen world back to their ignorance of God. Men did not like to retain Him in their knowledge, and hence their degradation and ruin. The duty therefore of the first teachers of Christianity was to set forth a system of doctrines, and by manifestation of the truth commend themselves to every man's conscience. They cared nothing for feeling, except as it was produced by knowledge of the truth. And they held those and only those to be Christians who accepted their doctrinal statements as true, and exhibited a corresponding state of heart and mode of life. A holy unbeliever and an unholy believer were to them a contradiction in terms.

2. Mistaken view of *revelation*. According to the Scripture God revealed His will to His servants in a direct objective manner. This was done in a variety of ways—by ministering angels, in visible signs and tokens, in voices to the rapt ear, in visions of the night, in deep sleep as to Abram, or mouth to mouth as to Moses, and in prophetic ecstasy—but always as a communication from without the man himself. Consider the express statement of the Apostle Peter, that the prophets “searched what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow”—where there is a sharp discrimination between the author and the recipient of the revelation. But the modern theory supposes that men themselves, through some favoring natural circumstances, providential or religious, but in no sense supernatural, were so exalted in their sensibilities that they could intuitively apprehend the things of God. Such a revelation is no revelation. It is an abuse of terms to call it such.

3. It fatally limits the *scope of revealed truth*. Inspiration, according to it, is simply the mind gazing upon and receiving what are called “eternal verities,” *i. e.*, universal and necessary truths, which alone are the objects of intuition. But how

long would it be before any man, no matter how endowed, would, by meditating upon God, evolve the doctrine of a unity of persons in the essence of the Godhead? That is an eternal verity, but certainly one that could never be known but by an objective revelation. But other cardinal and characteristic features of Christianity are not eternal verities at all, *e. g.*, the fall of man, the depravity of the race, the divine-human character of Jesus of Nazareth, the salvation of men by the blood and intercession of our Lord, the resurrection of the same body at the last day. These are truths of the highest moment, and make our religion what it is, but they have no place in man or in nature, they are not in any sense intuitive, and no exaltation of the religious consciousness of man would ever have enabled any man to discover them of himself. And the same remark may be made as to the historical prophecies which are so marked a feature of the Scriptures *e. g.*: That Abraham should possess Canaan, that his posterity should be bondmen in Egypt, that they should be restored to the promised land, that they should again be captives in Babylon and after 70 years be a second time restored, that Christ should be born of a virgin in Bethlehem, should die on the cross, be buried and yet rise on the third day, that the Jews should reject Him, and in consequence be scattered over the earth and yet be preserved a distinct people. All these were predicted long before they came to pass; but no degree of spiritual elevation could enable a man to foresee them. They do not belong to the class of objects of which the religious consciousness takes notice. To say that an eminently holy man could foreknow such events is as absurd as to say that if a man had a good telescope he could see who is to be President of the United States in 1900.

4. This theory *destroys the authority of the Bible as a Rule of Faith*. The common doctrine is that, as the Belgic Confession says, "the word of God was not sent or delivered by the will of man, but that holy men of God, etc., and that these holy and divine writings are received for the reg-

ulation, foundation and confirmation of our faith (iii, v) and that whatever does not agree with this infallible rule is to be rejected." (viii). The Bible therefore contains the thoughts of God, and in that character controls our belief. But the modern theory makes it contain only the thoughts of men—holy men and exalted men—and yet men destitute of supernatural aid. If this be so, then they are no authoritative guide. Men's logical understanding clothed in a certain form the intuitions due to their religious feelings. Other men are to judge of this accordingly. If the Scripture seems to them the best expression of their own religious experience, they will adopt it; if not, not; or perhaps they will take a part and reject the rest. But in any case the reason of their course lies not in the Scripture, but in themselves. Even if they accept the Bible, it is not because it is God's own testimony respecting Himself, but because their own experience confirms it. So it is no rule at all, but a plastic lump to be molded by every man to suit his own notions and caprices.

In truth, this entire theory is from beginning to end opposed to the plain and obvious sense of the Bible. The one great demand of the Gospel is faith, not feeling—faith in the divine truths revealed and proposed for human guidance. The great commission directed the Apostles to go and disciple all nations, teaching them what Christ had commanded; and these apostolic messengers constantly propounded their doctrines as the revealed wisdom of God—standing in sharp contrast with the wisdom of men. If a man received their doctrines and sustained them by a corresponding life, he was a Christian. If on the other hand he rejected them, he was an unbeliever and an heir of perdition. It is then a serious error to make a man's creed of little or no importance, for the Lord Jesus Christ said "He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be condemned."

VI. THE TRUE DOCTRINE. The ground having thus been comparatively cleared, by exposing the errors which have pre-

vailed on one side or the other, it is time now to turn to the positive statement of the truth.

An important and very needful preliminary remark is that Inspiration is to be carefully discriminated from Revelation on one hand, and Spiritual Illumination on the other. It is less than the former and more than the latter. Confusion on this point is fatal to the due apprehension of the subject. Indeed a large portion of the popular objections to the church's doctrine is founded upon the inability to distinguish Revelation from Inspiration. And yet the two things are entirely distinct. They do not in any degree depend upon or imply each other. They proceed from different persons in the Godhead—Christ is the great Revealer; The Holy Ghost inspires. They are not necessarily given to the same persons. One man may have revelations without inspiration, and another have inspiration without revelation. Revelation means the supernatural disclosure of truth not before known*—Inspiration, the unerring record of that truth or any other, however acquired. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob received many divine communications, teaching them what they could have learned in no other way; but so far as we know, not one of them was inspired to make a written record of these revelations. And our knowledge of the fact comes from a different person altogether. So the Apostle Paul was caught up into the third heaven, and heard unspeakable words, but he was not inspired to record these words, because they were such as it is not lawful for a man to utter. On the other hand we know not that Luke ever enjoyed a revelation, yet he was inspired to make the record called, *The Acts of the Apostles*. The two things are then altogether distinct, both in conception and actual experience. Yet they are equally necessary for the purposes of the church. For supposing a divine communication to be made, it would be of little or no use with-

* Whether because its subject matter transcends human powers, as prophecy; or because, although knowable in the ordinary way, it was not in fact known to the receiver of the revelation, as in the case of Elisha and the Shunamite, (2 Kings iv. 27).

out an inspired record of it, for otherwise we could have no certainty that the Revelation was correctly transmitted, or even that it was rightly apprehended by the recipients themselves. Yet even eminent men have confounded these things, *e. g.*, *Grotius* admitted the inspiration of some parts of the Bible, but the histories he said needed no such influence, for it was enough if their writers had good memories, and were careful in their narrative. So Bishop Warburton maintained that it would be "putting the Holy Ghost on an unnecessary employment to suppose that he dictated the historical parts of Scripture, for the writers did not need his immediate assistance, to do this part of their business for them." These writers forgot that it is one thing to impart knowledge, and another to control the communication of that knowledge to others.

But while Inspiration is different from Revelation and less than it, on the other hand, it is different from the gracious illumination common to all believers, and very much more than that. One of the modern forms of error on the subject denies this. Not to speak of the German writers (*Twisten*, *Nitzsch*, etc.), *Coleridge* attributes a large part of the Scripture to "that grace and communion of the Spirit which the church under all circumstances, and every regenerate member is permitted to hope, and instructed to pray for." *Dr. Arnold* and *Archdeacon Hare* have written much to the same effect. And *Mr. Maurice* says that "We must forego the demand we make upon the conscience of young men when we compel them to declare that they regard the inspiration of the Bible as generically unlike that which God bestows upon His children in this day." So *F. W. Robertson*: "The prophetic power in which I suppose is chiefly exhibited that which we mean by Inspiration, depends almost entirely on moral greatness. The prophet discerned large principles, true for all time—principles social, political, ecclesiastical and principles of life, chiefly by largeness of heart and sympathy of spirit with God's Spirit." (*Life II.*, 145).

We affirm, on the contrary, that there is just this generic difference. There is a real and most important influence of the

Holy Ghost, bestowed upon all Christians, who are renewed, sanctified, led, guided, comforted and taught by the Heavenly Paraclete. But this is specifically different from inspiration, which is confined to a few selected persons. The work of the Spirit on believers as such is altogether subjective and directed to their individual improvement and growth in grace. His work on the authors of the Scripture is altogether objective, and designed for the benefit of the Church. The authority of these writers in no degree depends upon their sinlessness, or even their eminent personal holiness. The design of their inspiration was not at all to render them morally perfect, but to make them in their teaching infallible organs of the truth. That such is the fact is shown, not only by the acknowledged shortcomings of many of these writers, such as David, Solomon, Jonah and Peter, but also by the circumstance that in two instances men without any apparent sanctifying grace, and who lived and died outside of the fold of faith, were yet made the media of signal prophecies—viz. Balaam and Caiphas—cases which would seem to have been providentially ordained, one in the Old Testament and the other in the New, on purpose to afford this distinguishing test of the nature of Inspiration. So, on the other hand, Barnabas was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, and greatly blessed in his work, yet he was not inspired to record the divine will. The same was true of Apollos who was eloquent and mighty in the Scripture, and fervent in spirit, and an able reasoner. Nor do the sacred writers ever base their claims to a hearing, on any subjective excellence of their own, but upon the fact that God spoke through them. They were His messengers, His witnesses, His spokesmen, and therefore their teaching came with the weight of divine authority. To deny it, to take from it, or to add to it, incurred a tremendous anathema. Therefore the Church has always made the broadest distinction between the writings of inspired men and those of ordinary believers. Even Romanists with all their reverence for the fathers, never presumed to place their writings upon a level with the Scriptures. And

all the historical churches of the Reformation agree with the Belgic confession—"Neither may we compare any writings of men, though ever so holy, with those divine Scriptures, for all men are of themselves liars and less than vanity itself. Therefore we reject with all our hearts, whatsoever doth not agree with this infallible rule, which the Apostles have taught us, saying, 'Try the Spirits whether they be of God,' likewise 'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house.'"

Hence it is obvious to remark that there are :

VII. NO DEGREES OF INSPIRATION.—The contrary opinion is of old date, and in Great Britain was for a long time the common mode of representation. Its origin is to be traced to Maimonides, the greatest of the Jewish doctors since the time of our Lord. This learned rabbi was born at Corduba, in Spain, in 1131, and was a pupil of Averroes from whom he gained the knowledge of Aristotle. And his views of Inspiration, it is thought were suggested to him by the Mohammedan philosophers who make subtle distinctions between the Koran and other alleged prophetic writings. Maimonides assigned a pre-eminent position to Moses, who, he said, prophesied, while awake, and not in a dream or vision as others—saw God face to face—and had the gift continuously. After Moses, there were eleven distinct degrees of prophecy which he recounts at length. From these Abarbanel (1437) deduced the three degrees which thenceforward became the accepted Jewish doctrine on the subject. 1. The Mosaic, under which the Law was written. 2. The Prophetic, under which the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, with the major prophets (except Daniel) and all the minor, were composed, and: 3. That of the Holy Spirit, by whose guidance all the rest, called Hagiographa, were written. This Jewish figment, which has absolutely no foundation whatever in the Scriptures, but indeed is in direct opposition to some of its plainest statements, seems to have given rise to the theory of partial Inspiration, maintained by such men as the eloquent Bishop Lowth, the learned

Whitby, the excellent Doddridge, Principal Hill of the Kirk of Scotland, Dr. Dick of the Associate Church, Bishop Wilson of Islington, and the eminent Independent, Dr. Henderson. Some of them make three degrees of Inspiration, others four, and Dr. Henderson, five, which he denominates: 1. A divine excitement. 2. Invigoration or elevation. 3. Superintendence. 4. Guidance. 5. Direct Revelation.

The obvious objections to this view, however stated, are, 1. That it is, at most, a *mere hypothesis*, without any warrant in Scripture. Nowhere is there a hint of any such diversity of divine influence, but the broad affirmation is, "Every inspired Scripture is also," etc. This and similar passages before quoted, cover the entire contents of the sacred volume, the Old and the New, the matter and the manner, the thoughts and the words, the prose and the poetry, the narratives and the discussions, the leading points and the minor details.

2. This view puts *large portions of Scripture under a cloud as destitute of divine authority*. Hear so good a man as Bishop Wilson saying, "What the extent of inspiration was in each case, we need not, indeed, we cannot, determine. We infer from the uniform language of the New Testament that in each case such assistance, and only such assistance, was afforded as the exigencies of it required. Where nature ended and inspiration began, it is not for man to say." Of course then there is a part of the Scripture—though no man can say how much or where it is—which is a result of pure nature, and does not carry with it the authority of God at all. If so, we are all at sea, and never know when we stand on solid ground.

3. The idea of degrees of inspiration is *absurd*. For God's word is infallible because inspired, and how can there be degrees of infallibility? An inspiration to be of any account must be complete, or, as the technical phrase is, plenary. Any limitation of it, just so far as that limitation extends, destroys it, and we pass over from the wisdom of God to the wisdom of men as the ground of our faith and hope.

VIII. DEFINITION.—Inspiration is a *divine influence upon*

the sacred writers making their record of revelation infallible throughout in thought and expression. It did not reveal to them anything, but guided them in recording what was revealed. It did not make them perfect or unerring in other things, but only as writers of the Scripture. It was therefore plenary in the just and accurate sense of that term, i. e., it secured the absolute correctness of the record in all its parts, both as to fact and doctrine. In all matters of science, philosophy and history, the authors of Scripture stood on the level of their contemporaries, but when they took in hand the writing of God's revealed will, His Holy Spirit rendered them true and unerring.

But this does not mean that they became mere machines, or that they lost their self-consciousness, or suffered a suspension of any of their intellectual faculties. Instead of being unconscious instruments, it was active, thinking, willing minds that the Holy Ghost used as His organs. And these minds retained all their distinctive individual characteristics. Each writer used the language to which he was accustomed and followed the bent of his own mind, whether it were lyrical like David, or logical like Paul, or emotional and contemplative like John, or didactic like James. We find this to be the case even in prophecy. Isaiah soars to heaven in flights of unequalled sublimity, while Haggai and Malachi creep on the ground in a serene and unimpassioned course. The herdman Amos wanders in the pastures, and draws his similitudes from the mildew on the vine, or the lion invading the fold, or the starry skies beneath which the shepherd feeds his flocks. The gorgeous symbolism of Chaldea is reflected in every page of Ezekiel and Daniel, while Jeremiah, a prophet of priestly race, has ever before him the various features of the Theocracy—the temple, the altar and the ark. Much more must this be the case in the other forms of Inspiration. The writers retain all the features of genius, character, thought and feeling, which belong to them by nature, or result from their several social positions. God used them as His organs—each according to His peculiar gifts

and endowments. They wrote out of the fullness of their own thoughts and feelings, and selected such language as seemed appropriate to them. Yet they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and their words were God's words.

Nor did it make any difference as to the source whence the several penmen gained their materials, whether from personal experience, as David; or tradition, as Moses; or historical inquiries, as Luke; or logical argumentation, as Paul; or immediate revelation, as John—in any and all cases an infallible Spirit guided them in the selection and arrangement. So then the Bible is in one sense all human, in another all divine, or better still, it is divine-human. The two elements are united much as they are in the miraculous person of our Lord Jesus Christ. He was fully and certainly man, and at the same time He was fully and certainly God. So the Bible is truly and unquestionably human, and yet truly and unquestionably divine.

This is sometimes pronounced absurd and contradictory, but most unjustly. Cannot God control rational creatures without turning them into machines? If not, then the doctrine of grace, the doctrine of Providence—nay, the doctrine of Theism itself, must be surrendered. But we are left to no such dread alternative. When Joseph's brethren sold him into Egypt they were free yet fulfilled a divine purpose. A soul is never more free than when it turns to God in faith and repentance, yet this is only of grace. The freest agents among all creatures are angels and the spirits of just men made perfect, yet their stability is secured by a divine decree. There is nothing unphilosophical or unscriptural in asserting the entire freedom and naturalness of the penmen of the Scriptures, and at the same time their divine and supernatural guidance.

Such then is substantially the doctrine of the evangelical church at this day. It is a doctrine which, by its mere statement, cuts off a host of difficulties and objections. It gives full and free play to each of the factors which the very name inspiration implies. It accounts for all the facts in the case. It furnishes a steady and uniform basis of faith. It binds all

parts of the sacred volume into one integral and organized whole. It preserves the supernatural element throughout, yet parades no needless miracle, and offers no violence to the reason or the consciousness of thoughtful men.

Consequently, we have the mind and will of God for salvation—the unerring arbiter of all truth and duty—revealed to us in human language, and yet miraculously free from the soiling touch of human depravity. Not more clearly are the heavens in all their majesty and glory the work of God than is that collection of writings which we call the Bible, the word of God. All else may fail, but this shall stand. Heaven and earth may pass, but the word of the Lord abideth forever.

III.

MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

It is not proposed to attempt to treat this subject from a specialist's standpoint, nor in a critical manner. I shall take a practical view of the subject,—such a view as concerns the ministry in its ordinary pastoral services.

Our subject has become the “burning question” of the hour. It may not be ignored by the ministry. The attempt to do so by a minister might have some show of being successfully vindicated were it not that the subject is so closely allied to his work and position, that it does not ignore him. If *he* does not desire to meet it, it scruples not to cross him at every turn of his path. Its interrogation points everywhere stare him in the face in his Biblical study. The atmosphere he breathes is impregnated with it. Hence every pastor should devote at least as much time as he can to its study. Perhaps all that is possible for the ordinary pastor, with his rounds of pastoral and preaching work, is that he endeavor to inform himself of the “results” of this study, as fast as they are announced by specialists whose time and inclination and possibly duties and positions force them to pay close attention to “processes.” And yet, to do even this intelligently it is necessary to know somewhat of these processes. Look upon it, therefore, from whatever view we may, it cannot but become our duty, to look carefully at the subject under consideration.

I have worded the subject advisedly as “*Modern* Biblical Criticism.” There is a marked difference between what is generally termed “Biblical Criticism,” and what is understood by

the term "*Modern Biblical Criticism.*" The former means a general critical study, be it either in so-called higher or lower criticism of the Scriptures, for the purpose of learning the truth in regard to the integrity of the writings, their authenticity, their style, and their credibility. "These four questions," as Dr. Briggs says, "of the higher critics confront every student who ventures a little below the surface in his study of Holy Scripture. How shall we answer them and gain a reasonable degree of accurate knowledge respecting them?"* Now no one can possibly hold that it is not well that a thoroughly devout and prayerful critical study of the Bible should be made so as to find out all the facts and circumstances connected with the original gift and subsequent transmission of God's revealed, or if you wish, objective preceptive will.† Give us no guess-work upon which to base our hopes and knowledge of salvation. Even the conservative Dr. Green, of Princeton, said: "There is everything to hope and nothing to fear from the progress" of Biblical Criticism. And even though, when the Bible is thus studied some of the results reached cause us to give up many of our interpretations of Scripture, we need not fear that Scripture itself is being given up. We should in studying Biblical Criticism always have before our minds this one question: Is Scripture itself affected by it; or are only my interpretations of Scripture touched? For we must constantly bear in mind that it may be disastrous to the progress of truth to neglect to make a distinction between what really is Scripture truth, and what is simply our interpretation of it.

Gladly granting all that has been said, yet Modern Biblical Criticism—more particularly understood in our day by the term: "The Higher Criticism,"—enters upon the critical study of the Bible hampered with biassing preconceptions, with as-

* "The Bible, the Church and the Reason," p. 125.

† "Faith is good, but a faith that is neither enlightened nor determined by facts in the shape of evidence, but simply by the blind assent with which the mind sets itself upon its object, may be as much a basis of superstition as of religion." "Movements of Religious Thought," by John Tulloch, D.D., p. 68.

sumptions, that in many cases materially shade and direct the study in formulated grooves, and thus the critic can have a Bible that suits his own preconceptions as to what ought to constitute the Word of God; and must of necessity reject what does not agree with his preconceived theory. Who realizes not throughout when reading Kuenen or Wellhausen, that their study of Israel's history is biassed by their elimination of all supernaturalism from it, and that this elimination must of necessity give a certain trend to all their interpretations and understandings of the Old Testament? And so we find that in the hands of Matthew Arnold the Bible is cut to pieces in one way—see his “God and the Bible,”—and in the hands of Strauss and Renan with their fundamental idea that “miracles are impossible,” and in the hands of the “Tübingen School,” and of the brilliant author of “Ecce Homo,” the Bible is dissected in a variety of ways. Hence there is a marked difference between this “Modern Biblical Criticism,” and what is generally denominated “Biblical Criticism.”

In our estimate of the “Higher Criticism” as to its value, we cannot be positive, or final, for specialists themselves are far from agreeing as to questions involved. Still it is not altogether inappropriate to pause and inquire what, if anything, has been gained, and what, if anything, has been lost by it in the way of Bible study. To condemn it wholesale may not be done; to accept it unquestioningly is just as much, if not more, out of all keeping for the minister of the Gospel. Let us, then, inquire in regard to our subject in the spirit of the sentence just written.

I believe that Modern Biblical Criticism has brought to the Christian world an indirect gain in this particular, viz.: By it, and because of it, in our day attention is universally called to *a direct study of the Bible*. That is to say, the destructive attacks upon the Bible by some who claim to be of the “household of faith,” their apparently reckless treatment has directed to the Bible the attention of many who were occupied with discussions of things suggested by it,* who were speculating about

* Briggs calls it “dogmatism and traditionalism.”

it, but were not engaged in its direct study. When, *e. g.* a half century or more ago, the attacks of Paulus and Strauss followed by Renan, upon the Gospel and the Person of Christ, were made, the world had never studied directly the New Testament sources of information as to the life of Christ as thoroughly as after these assaults. The doctrinal, not to say dogmatical statements made by the ecumenical councils during the early centuries of the Church, had been thoroughly enough expounded and discussions had been earnest enough *about* Christ and His work; but these attacks led a Lange, a Tholuck, and so forth, directly to the New Testament in critical study as to the Person of the Saviour, with the happy result that Christ as a personal Saviour and Redeemer was made more real to the world.

If we can turn men's attentions from a discussion or study of theories about Scripture, and the non-essentials of religion to a direct study of the Bible with its "plain fact of a personal Creator, a God in history, a revelation of divine love, and duty in His Son," we have gained much; * and not the least gain is the fact that when this has been done "we need not fear the atheism of to-day." There is nothing so refreshing to the thirsty soul, as to go directly to the fountain of truth and drink deep draughts of divine, loving, inspiring truth. If it is served at second-hand, be it brought in ever such beautiful and attractive cups, it loses its sparkle and its full power to assuage the thirst.

Whatever, therefore, turns men's attention to a direct study of the Bible is a great gain to true religion. And it cannot be disguised that modern Biblical Criticism has done this, and herein we again learn the truth of this Scripture: "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee, the residue of wrath shalt thou gird upon thee." †

* An English Bible was found in the harbor of Nagasaki, Japan. Two brothers read it; one of them testified as follows: "I cannot tell my feelings when for the first time I read of the character and work of Jesus Christ. I had never seen or heard or imagined such a person. I was filled with admiration, overwhelmed with emotion and taken captive by the record of His nature and life."

† Ps. 76: 10.

As a result of leading to a direct study of the Bible must be noted that it becomes a more *real* Book to us. It has not always been such to men. They looked upon its history, poetry, song and story as something which had nothing in common with other history, poetry, song and story. True, the Bible is a *sui generis* Book; a Book that, in its application and teaching has for its object something distinct from any other book on earth; it has its peculiar characteristics, it possesses traits that differentiate it from all earth's literature. It could not well be otherwise, if it is an inspired book in a special sense, and is to be "our supreme and sole authority in matters of faith, and 'contains all truth necessary for salvation.'" The fact that it has so distinct an object, and has characteristics of so unique a nature, has led men to look upon it as if it were not a real book—a book which *all* should read, ponder and study. This being the case, it was laid aside for only special use, and was not used for the good and elevating influence it can have upon this life, with its true history, its high-toned morality, its pure and lofty language, its rich store of literature, its sublime poetry, and its remarkable delineations of human nature.

This led to three things:

(a) The Bible was not man's constant companion to help him, to cheer him, to instruct him, to encourage him, to warn him in his every-day life, as well as in his distinctively devotional and church life.

(b) Much valuable knowledge which the Bible contains aside from teaching in regard to a knowledge of God and salvation, was kept hid from men's view. Thus men were taught what Sir Walter Scott said so emphatically: "There is but one book, the Bible. The other books are mere leaves, fragments." And what our Whittier has written:

"We search the world for truth; we cull
The good, the pure, the beautiful
From graven stone and written scroll,
From all old flower-fields of the soul;

And weary seekers of the best,
We come back laden from the quest,
To find that all the sages said,
Is in the Book our mothers read."

(e) People dared not approach the Bible with that holy boldness that makes it an arbitrator in all disputes with conscience in the various departments of life, apart from the salvation of the soul. Witness Luther before his conversion ; he did not go to it to find peace of soul, it being chained from free and universal use.

Now the science of Biblical Criticism has assisted in making the Bible a more real Book, and Robertson Smith was correct when he said in his introductory lecture in his "*Old Testament in the Jewish Church*," that here is the great value of Biblical Criticism.'

Frankly admitting all this, it is damagingly true that the "Higher Criticism" of our day goes too far in this direction. It looks upon the Bible too much as it does upon a book of merely human origin, eliminating all supernaturalism from and reading into the Bible naturalistic evolution, and hence has a tendency to destroy the becoming reverence and holiness with which we should approach it, no matter how real it becomes or may be to us. The true course lies between the two extremes. And if the Biblical Criticism of to-day could but be brought to this, the danger with which it menaces the Church and the Bible would be averted ; and in the hope that it will do so, let us not ignore it or uncharitably condemn it *in toto*. For, as Prof. Green rightly says : "Every encouragement should be given to the freest possible discussion. The attempt to stifle discussion in the present posture of affairs, would be in every way damaging to the truth."

Another thing that Biblical criticism results in is the discovery of new and advanced Bible truths. Daniel Webster but expresses what must be true, when he said : "There is more valuable truth yet to be gleaned from the sacred writings that has thus far escaped the attention of commentators, than from

all other sources of human knowledge combined." Happy that science that has for its object this desirable end! The curse to itself of Modern Biblical Criticism is that, however much in the all-wise and gracious over-ruling Providence of God, indirectly and unintentionally this end is to some extent at least, being accomplished, it points its criticisms in such a way that it discredits faith in the inspiration, the inerrancy, and hence the authority of the Bible, making it not *the* but only *a* source of authority.

One particular of Modern Biblical Criticism calls for notice. By it the two extreme phases of Biblical interpretation—the allegorical and the dogmatic—have been largely done away with; resting the defense of revelation upon a ground that commends itself to sound reason and common sense and upon ascertained facts. The arbitrary fancies and the mystical principles of the Allegorists cannot satisfy this age of critical knowledge of history and language. "The truth of Christ and His spiritual Gospel which only could give the key to the Old Testament, was indeed a profound one. But, instead of studying it in the clear method of history, the Bible was made a sacred anagram; the most natural facts of Jewish worship or Chronicle became arbitrary figures of the new dispensation. Type and allegory were the master-key that unlocked all the dark chambers from the early chapters of the Genesis to the poetry of David or the grand utterances of Isaiah. Whenever we turn to the Fathers, to the Epistles of Clement, or the sober Irenæus, to Tertullian, who finds the type of Baptism in the Spirit brooding on the waters and in the passage through the sea; or to Augustine, who explains the six creative days as symbols of divine history, we have the numberless cases of this style of exposition. We prize the early Christian writers for their intellectual and spiritual power in the great conflict of faith with a Pagan wisdom; nay, we can often admire, with Coleridge the rich, devout fancy glowing through the homilies of Augustine; but as Biblical scholars, all were simply of a time when true criticism was hardly known."*

* Dr. Washburn in *Princeton Review*, July, 1879.

Nor will the dogmatic principle of the Latin Church satisfy men of to-day; a principle that found in the Bible, by proof texts, wrested from their real meaning often, support for any metaphysical or religious dogma which may be held. Luther called such a procedure "a rover and a chamois-hunter." It was wise in Luther to reject the *analogia fidei*, and claim the *analogia Scripturæ* as that which should be adopted. All arbitrary rules, or preconceived faith, or preconceived notions should be laid aside in the study of the Bible; that should be studied in its own meaning.* Hail that Biblical Criticism that will cause men to do this!

But now consider what harm, if any, Modern Biblical Criticism has so far done.

For one thing, it has caused men to look upon the study of the Bible as a mere critical process. When men do this they lose the spirituality of heart and the inspiration to personal piety that come from reading it in loving trust, and with a devotional heart. There is a great difference between reading the Bible with an eye merely to finding in it literary beauty, and history, and reading it in a devotional state of mind for growth in spirituality of heart and personal piety, finding in it the voice of God to the soul, and the reflection of the mind of a loving Father who has in it recorded His message to the soul, giving oneself up while reading it to sweet passages of love, with the God of love. We must never forget—and Modern Biblical Criticism tends to cause us to do so, hence its danger and injury—that the purpose for which the Bible was written, was not its literary and historical value; on the contrary, it was given to us for our growth in Christian spirit and character, and as a revelation of God's will to and concerning man, a message of salvation full and complete in Jesus Christ. Some one has well written: "This word may speak to the mind and heart of a Christian reader, although he knows nothing of the

* A pious monk has said: "Whoever seeketh an interpretation in this Book shall get an answer from God; whoever bringeth an interpretation to this Book shall get an answer from the devil."

methods of exact learning, and if the keenest criticism do not approach it with special reverence for a Book which has fed the spiritual life of men as no other book has done, it will be barren indeed even for the scholar." Because the tendency of Modern Biblical Criticism is in this direction, is it harmful. In the words of another we may say: "This critical spirit is no mood in which to derive practical benefit from the Bible. As a drill for the intellectual faculties, as a stimulus for the investigation of ancient literature, manners, and civilization generally, it may be useful. But it stands in the way of receiving spiritual help. Moreover it interferes with what may be called the *structural* appreciation of the sacred writings. As we find them, each, with all its diversities of parts, rises before us in a kind of architectural unity. But this critical spirit dissolves the fabric." Then this same writer uses this emphatic illustration: "Suppose one was to go into St. Peter's, and instead of studying it as it is, taking in its grandeur, and being lifted up by its esthetic appeals, should set himself about resolving it into its historic elements, and re-arranging them in the order of their construction, assigning the different parts to their respective architects—this to Bramonti, that to Michael Angelo, that to Vignola, that to Carlo Maderno, and that to Bernini,—would not this analytical spirit make it impossible for him to appreciate the structure as it stands and lead him to descend from the plane of art, to historical pedantry and *finesse*? So if we are looking always at seams, transpositions and unhistorical narratives in the Scriptures, we cannot take in the separate parts in their proper structural relations, and the whole fabric falls into a mass of *disjecta membra*."

Anything, therefore, that causes men to look upon the Bible in any other way than a devout spiritual frame of mind is fanciful. Has not modern Biblical criticism tended that way, to say the least? Is it not doing so now? Having raised its many doubts—many uncalled for and unfounded doubts we may add—it has led men to take up their Bibles with an eye too exclusively critical and to study them with a mind bristling with interrogation points.

Hence another charge that we bring against the "Higher Criticism" is, that it has a tendency to cause men to lose their confidence in the Bible. This may not be seen or felt so much among specialists in Bible study, or among ministers, who have time and inclination and whose work it is to study the Bible critically, as among the people in general, who have neither time, nor inclination, nor facility to follow out the discussions, and only know that doubts exist in the minds of men who make Biblical study a specialty. Learning that these are unsettled on many points, the natural consequence is that doubts and distrust are awakened in their minds and they lose their faith in the Bible.*

Nothing more lamentable can befall a human soul than to lose trust in God's Word. That sets it adrift upon the uncertain ocean of life without a compass, without a guide, without light. Anything that beclouds the sky of faith in the Bible, and relegates it to a dismal murkiness, is a calamity to the world. This "Modern Biblical Criticism" is liable to do, and has done. "If the critics could penetrate this cloudy region with the clear light of definite and fixed principle recognized and admitted by all, and could reconstitute the history so as to leave an unmistakable historical record, and give us at least a Bible in the new form that would be unquestionable in the order of events, the distrust might soon be over. But they have no common principles of readjustment. Each critic has his own principles and his own method of applying them. No one but the illuminated seers themselves can reproduce the ancient history, and no one of them does it five years in succession in the same way." "Higher Criticism," therefore, has no settled ground upon which to ask a following. "Whither?"—this is the wailing cry

* A case in point, extreme perhaps, but significant, was the experience of a chaplain in a penitentiary with a convict. In religious conversation with one of the prisoners, the latter said he had no faith in the Bible. When the Chaplain urged him to trust in its offers of salvation, he, writes the Chaplain, "fell back on the man in New York, who says the Bible is not free from error."

of the confused, bemuddled, drifting soul, that tries to follow its lead.

Then further, Israel E. Dwinell has conclusively shown that "The Higher Criticism" upsets Biblical theology; in fact it makes a Biblical theology next to impossible for "the higher critics detect more than one redactor in the same book—redactor beyond redactor, in separate and independent lines; and each of the blind series is to be Biblically theologized, and have his contribution separately noted and put in a book!" What a medley! Dwinell says: "We have under these circumstances, instead of one Biblical theology of each book, endless Biblical theologettes, each based on an excerpt of the book, having no fixed and determinate boundaries belonging to an uncertain age and author, and separated from the rest by the infallibility of the critic. So the promising, robust, manly modern science of Biblical theology goes off in invisible spray and nothingness. The materials with which it has to do, under the touch of the Higher Criticism, are tremulous and fugitive, and no science can be built up on them." *

Is it not Biblical theology rather than systematic and dogmatic theology, which latter, are but too often founded upon preconceived theories and systems of metaphysics, that gives us the real theology that ought to be accepted?

And thus also, the Higher Criticism destroys the inspiration of the Scriptures. For according to it the Bible is a patchwork of history, of poetry, of morals, the whole made up, by the redactors and editors and copyists, "into a pretended framework of history in which to set their characters and instructions." Of course if inspiration is to be claimed for such work at all, it is of a very weak and meaningless sort, that amounts to nothing—that may be rhetorically beautiful, but is logically untenable.†

* See "Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism," by various writers, No. 9. Funk & Wagnalls: 1888.

† This is an attempt to hold up the Scriptures in the air while the support on which they rest is taken away,—to lift them by rhetoric and pull them

As far as receiving the Higher Criticism is concerned, it cannot well be done, for it is all so unsettled, that one knows hardly what to receive; and that which to-day one may take as a settled possession, to-morrow may be taken from him to be replaced by that which in turn may as summarily be set aside.

What we want more than any one other thing in this day of drifting, and unrest, and unsettledness, is a hearty, grateful, recognition and acceptance of and an implicit trust in the Bible, as the foundation of our morality, and the final arbitrator in the social, political and religious confusion of the day, and an exemplification in the hearts and lives of the people of the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as revealed in the Blessed Book. Thank God thus far,—and will it not be so always?—the fiery shafts of destructive criticism hurled against it have fallen broken, spoiled, ineffective to the ground; the heaviest blows have proven useless in beating it out of the world. The blows react in destructive power upon him who attacks it.

"Last eve I passed beside a blacksmith's door,
And heard the anvil ring the vesper chime;
Then looking in, I saw upon the floor
Old hammers worn with beating years of time.

'How many anvils have you had?' said I,
'To wear and batter all these hammers so?'
'Just one' he answered, then with twinkling eye,
'The anvil wears the hammer out, yon know?'

And so, I thought, the anvil of God's Word,
For ages skeptic blows have beat upon;
Yet though the noise of falling blows were heard,
The anvil is unworn—the hammers gone."

down by logic. It is evident that nothing sharply and divinely authoritative can be left in them. They drop down in kind of writing to the level of the productions of saints whose productions do not happen to be put in the canon. So not only is a large part of the history, (the historical characters and the actual facts of the life of Israel) swept away, but also the very power by which a revelation in language and a direct authoritative message from God to mankind can be produced. All are gone. We are left bankrupt of a veritable Bible and the power by which such a Bible could be handed over to mankind."—DWIGHT.

Denver, Colo.

IV.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OBJECTIVE AND SACRAMENTAL IN CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. J. W. LOVE, A. M.

THE prevailing tendency of many Protestant Christians seems to be to deny or ignore the significance of the objective and sacramental in Christianity, or at least to regard the subjective as of most importance. There are not a few people, devotedly pious in feeling and purpose, who, without intending it, would yet be their own saviours, or who, at least, base their hope of salvation rather upon what they are, and do, than upon what Christ is, and does for them.

The best of God's people,—as well as those not His people,—are prone to become one-sided in their views, and to emphasize too strongly that phase of truth which takes firmest hold of their mental being. Much will also depend upon the bias of early education, of constitutional peculiarity, and of environment as to what will be held for truth and the most important phases of truth. It is sometimes charged that the objective and sacramental run into formalism: that Romanists, for example, make all account of their Church relations; that they vainly imagine if they are baptized and confirmed members of the Church, go to confession, receive absolution and the sacraments of the Church, they are certain of salvation, especially if they or their friends can pay liberally to pray them out of purgatory, after departing this life. In other words, it is often represented that Roman Catholics expect mother Rome to save them on condition of a simple outward conformity to Church requirements, and ordinances, irrespective of what

their lives may be as to morality, and their hearts as to spirituality. There is no doubt much of truth in this charge. When the objective and sacramental in religion are made to be the mere outward, formal observance of rites and ceremonies, there may be an indifference to correctness of moral life, and a spiritual deadness, worse than no religion at all. But it is a misnomer to call this the true objective and sacramental: it is rather the subjective and unsacramental, whatever its pretensions may be.

Even the outward formalist, who depends on the objective and the sacramental for his salvation may be wholly subjective in doing so. He is so, if he expects to merit the favor of heaven by the doing of penance, the saying of prayers, or any formal observance of Church rites and ceremonies. Among educated and cultured classes of Romanists, as well as among the ignorant masses, there are doubtless many who expect to be saved by meritorious works—works that consist mainly in outward forms and ordinances, enjoined by bishops and priests,—blindly taking for granted, without investigation, that the demands of the priesthood are the same as the conditions of salvation, enjoined by the Scriptures. If bishops and priests were infallible; if they were always themselves unbiassed interpreters of the Scriptures; and above all, if they were all good and pure men, whose only desire is to lead their followers in the paths of Bible truth, their teaching might have the authority and sanction of Heaven. But there is no assurance that any human teachers, since the Apostles' day have been infallible; we also know that there are fearfully prejudiced men in the ministry, as well as out of it; and that even very bad men have frequently been clothed with holy orders, seeking them for sinister and selfish ends. It is not safe therefore to place ourselves blindly under the leadership of any set of men, or the teachings of any church, without exercising the God-given prerogative of reason to ascertain whether we are being led aright. It becomes us to "prove all things and hold fast to that which is good." On the other hand private judgment

may be carried to an extreme. We may discard the infallibility of the Pope and his subordinates, and yet claim it for ourselves. There are not a few self-made popes who would teach infallibly, *ex-cathedra*, and otherwise. Scores of them with glib tongues, and sophistical arguments have become founders of sects, and have a large following. Usually these wise (?) discoverers of new truth make some one special feature of their teaching the all important portion of divine revelation; as, for example, feet washing; going under the water backward or forward; observing the Lord's Supper sitting, or standing; discarding all jewelry in dress; wearing coats without buttons and of a particular cut, etc., etc., *ad nauseam*. That is to say, there are others besides Roman Catholics, who seem to base their hope of heaven on particular outward observances—their own good works. It is surprising, too, what superior piety most of these leaders of the sects develop in themselves and in their following! They are saints *par excellence*—if indeed, they admit any who differ with them to be saints at all—saints not because they believe in Christ, and live the precepts of His gospel in the sense of loving God with all their hearts and their neighbor as themselves, but because they wash each other's feet, observe some peculiar mode of baptism, or the Lord's Supper—saints because of their peculiar dress, or some other special mark of distinction! It is not much wonder that the average sinner grows weary with these unreasonable pretensions. It is enough to make us all, not only weary, but also heart-sick, that there should be so little exercise of common sense, to say nothing of true piety, on the part of so many professing to be devoted followers of the meek and lowly Nazarene.

Again, there is a large class of people who bank every thing on feeling, utterly ignoring the objective and the sacramental in religion. If only they feel happy as the result of some supposed special revelation, or supernatural manifestation, they are certain of heaven. They lay all stress upon *feeling*, forgetting that feeling comes and goes, and that it is the most unre-

liable part of human nature, whether in the natural and sin-fallen, or regenerate state. The Pharisee felt very happy in the conceit that he was so much holier than others, and the poor publican felt very miserable that he was so great a sinner, but the latter alone went down from the temple justified—not because of what he felt, but because he looked away from himself as the source of salvation to one higher and mightier than he, able to save, and in whose mercy he believed. Feeling may be all right as a result of yielding submissively to Christ, and taking Him at His word, but it should never be made the principle of salvation. We should never mistake the result for the cause.

Emotional people may be very pious; may truly love the Lord and be wholly consecrated to His service; but they should not make a merit of a constitutional peculiarity. It is their nature to feel deeply when they give earnest attention to the things pertaining to their soul's welfare. They are the shouters in religion, or politics as the case may be. They awaken enthusiasm even in the phlegmatic temperament and are a necessary element in Church and State. But they are in great danger of depending upon feeling for their acceptance with God, or rather of measuring their acceptance by their feelings. They too often fail to appreciate the importance of the objective and sacramental in Christianity. Governed mainly by feeling, they are not likely to develop a strong Christian character.

Again, the Objective and the Sacramental in Christianity will be ignored when the subjective takes the form of mere morality and humanitarianism, as is the case among Unitarians.

Not believing in the Deity of Jesus, and denying His vicarious atonement, they assume to be their own saviours, and teach that we are saved by character. Having no Christ in the gospel sense, they have no faith in the Objective and Sacramental, hence they have no church, or sacraments. In their view Jesus of Nazareth was only a man, divine in the sense that men and angels are divine—this and nothing more. We should imitate His upright life; model after His inimitable character.

This is all sufficient to save. There is no hell, or future punishment, and no deliverer is needed. All this we do not hesitate to characterize as "damnable heresy"—the very opposite of the teachings of Jesus Himself and His apostles. However moral, and worthy our Unitarian friends may be as citizens; they are certainly doing great harm to the cause of religion by their heretical teaching. Unbelievers, and those who want to live for the world, as an end in itself, can go into the Unitarian Society with all their unbelief and sins, and put conscience to sleep, in the belief that they are doing something pious. In other words, Unitarian teaching in its opposition to Orthodox scriptural interpretation, regarding the Objective and Sacramental, is leading many souls to perdition, who flatter themselves that they are on the way to a happy future life. It is deceiving many into believing that they can be righteous in themselves rather than in Christ, as the Scriptures teach. It does not require even a moral, godly life to have any hope of being saved, for most Unitarians would have us believe that all alike are saved, whether moral and God-fearing or not.

Strange that it should be so, yet there is no end to the heresies and absurdities taught and believed by many in the first circles of educated, cultured society, as well as among the ignorant and degraded. It is well known that some of our prominent society people are Spiritualists and Christian Scientists, who deny the existence of a personal God! In fact there is not an "ite" or "ism" of any kind, from agnosticism (which does not claim to know anything) up or down, that does not have educated, cultured followers.

The devil's greatest success seems to be in persuading men to deny or ignore the objective and sacramental in religion, and to adopt any theory or system that magnifies the subjective and unsacramental.

Now while there may be danger to orthodox Christianity in estimating too highly the objective and sacramental, or rather, I should say, in underestimating the subjective and depending altogether on the objective, as is admitted Romanists and

others may do, yet it is plain that the fatal error of the age is in denying or ignoring the importance of what Christ is, has done and is doing for the salvation of the world, and in neglecting the Church and her divinely ordained sacraments. There are certainly many very spiritual people in all our orthodox churches, whose desire it is to honor Christ, and who are consecrated to His service, but do yet unintentionally detract from His honor by too much faith in themselves; that is, by trusting in what they think they are and do, rather than in Christ as the principle and ground of their salvation.

If language means anything, the Scriptures plainly teach that Jesus Christ is an all-sufficient Saviour; that we cannot be in any measure or degree our own saviours; that *He* "is made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption" (1 Cor. 1 : 30); that *in Him* "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace" (Eph. 1 : 7); that we "are complete in Him" (Col. 2 : 10) and so on.

Of course it is not denied by any orthodox believers that Christ is our "all in all," or that the whole of our salvation is dependent upon His merit and mediation, and yet the fact remains that many do hope by their prayers and alms; by their consecration and good works in some way to merit the favor of heaven, so as to bring Christ under obligation to save them.

All agree that no one can be a Christian at all who is not obedient to the Gospel, given to prayer, and who does not have a benevolent heart. True faith in Christ necessitates devotion and consecration to His service, but their value is in the evidence of faith, and love to Christ, which they afford, and not in meriting any part of our salvation.

It is the objective Christ, in His person, life, and work, on whom alone we can rightly base any hope of being saved. Saving Christianity is not doctrine or duty—not what we believe or what we do. Important as it is to believe and do right, saving Christianity is infinitely more than either; it

is the possession of the Christ-life, and a communion of love in Christ, between God and man.

Dr. Gerhart has well said of this communion of love in Christ (Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vol. I, Chap. I, Section 18) that it "is reciprocal;" that "in Christ *God* is active toward man in goodness and grace;" that "in Christ *man* is active toward God by faith and the obedience of love." We may put it in another way, thus: In Christ God saves; in Christ man accepts of salvation and responds by faith and obedience of love. This thought could be amplified *ad libitum*. It is not necessary, however, to emphasize it further. Suffice it to say the only salvation revealed in the gospel is that of which Christ is the perennial source. The principle of this salvation is His very life begotten in us by the Holy Spirit, and which manifests itself in the communion of love between God and man. But while saving Christianity in its name and nature is God in Christ giving life, and man in Christ accepting life, yet God does not work in a magical way to convey this life and bring us into saving union with Christ. He has instituted the Christian Church to be the medium and bearer of His life, as also its means of nourishment and growth—I speak now of "the Holy Catholic Church," "the body of Christ," of which "He is the head," and of which all true believers must be "members." This Holy Catholic Church is an objective reality—a living, organic entity—a continuation in the world of the person, life and work of the divine-human Christ since His ascension to the right hand of the Father.

Now when, in the Apostles' Creed, the Church of Christ is qualified by the word Catholic, and is made an object of faith, we must not get a wrong conception of the term "Catholic." It is sometimes used synonymously with the term "Universal." But "universal" may mean *all* or *whole*. This thought is fully elaborated by Rev. Dr. John W. Nevin (see *MERCERSBURG REVIEW* 1852, articles on the Church Question.) In "all" we have a mere abstraction, as when we say *all men*, meaning thereby the mere collection of individuals. When, however, we

speak of the *whole* human family, we have something *concrete* in mind—an organic unity, where individuals as such have no separate existence, though they are a necessary part of the whole. I say, then, the word *universal* cannot be substituted for *catholic* unless the conception is that of a concrete whole—a oneness without reference to individual parts. The Catholic Church is the universality of a living organism in which Christ lives and reigns, and through which He is saving a lost world. Of course this Holy Catholic Church is made up of all God's true children of all ages and Christian denominations. But in its wholeness it includes more than the individuals who are the subjects of redeeming grace. As a living organism, its life is the life of the God-man; its soul is the Spirit of God; its laws the will of God, as in part revealed in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Nor is the Holy Catholic Church confined to earth; it also includes the heavenly host, all the redeemed of the Lord translated from the church militant to the church triumphant, with their glorified Head who reigns King of Kings and Lord of Lords in both worlds. "The Church in heaven and on earth but *one* communion make."

Still further, as a part of this "Holy Catholic Church" we must include the ordinances, and especially the sacraments of divine ordination.

In a word, the church of the Scriptures and of the Apostles' creed includes the persons of the Triune God, the family of God in heaven and on earth; the laws governing in the spiritual realm with all their sacramental functions and powers. As such the Church is an object of faith, a mystery of grace, an objective reality—a saving institution in the sense that there is Divine power, grace and love resident in it for all who are a living part of it.

If this be a correct Scriptural view of the Church it will be at once admitted by all holding such churchly view that the Church as an objective reality—a divine constitution and organism cannot be set aside or ignored by those who would be saved. It is the residence of the Divine Spirit, in which He is

active in enlightening the sin-darkened world, by the teaching and preaching of the Gospel; active in regeneration and sanctification in bringing home to the heart and conscience the truth taught and preached. The Holy Spirit, in the Church, (not outside of it), begets a new and divine life in the soul of the believer, and brings such soul into living union with Christ, through union with His body the Church. "Of Zion it shall be said, this and that man was born in her." (Ps. 87 : 5.)

It would seem, therefore, impossible for a man to be born from above, who despises church membership or regards it as only a form. If there is no objective sacramental reality in the Church—if it is not a substantial, organic entity for the saving of sinners, then it is nothing, and, of course, we may disregard it. But if the Church is the continuation of the person, life and work of Christ, then men must be brought into right relation to it, as a very part of it, in order to be saved. The old Latin fathers were right therefore when they said: "*Qui ecclesiam non habet matrem, Deum non habet Patrem,*"—and "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*"—"The Church" is not only "the Lamb's bride," but the "Mother of us all." (Gal. 4 : 26.)

Of course we must not forget, as Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff has truly said: "Church membership is not the *principle* of salvation—which is Christ alone—but the necessary *condition* of it, because it is the divinely appointed means of bringing the man into contact with Christ and all His benefits."

Those who look upon the Church as a mere society; an association of individuals for convenience, or mutual fraternal benefit, will naturally and logically undervalue the importance of the objective and sacramental in religion. In fact not a few of the unchurchly sects hold up their hands in holy horror when the Church and the observance of her divinely appointed ordinances are made any part of an essential condition to being saved.—They at once scent Romanism, and will not even listen to reason or Scripture, as teaching the true meaning of what

the Church is.—Naturally it depends very largely upon our standpoint as to how we see things. Those who view the Church from its subjective side will see only the subjective side, and *vice versa*. But the Scriptural and right standpoint is the subjective and objective combined, and taking this we shall see the truth—not in a one-sided way, but as it is in fact—and the Church itself will be “the pillar and ground of the truth.”

It may be safely asserted that it is impossible to make too much account of the objective and sacramental in Christianity, provided we also make proper account of the subjective. It is only half truths, or truths held in a one-sided way that are dangerous.

The sacramental in Christianity is always what God does for us, and not what we do. Thus true Scriptural baptism is God's act, not man's. It is God binding Himself as by an oath to do for man what he can not do for himself, and, in the sacramental act, actually doing for him that of which the sacrament is the sign and the seal. There must necessarily be outward form in administering the sacrament, but there is just as necessarily inward reality, when the form is rightly observed, and the reality rightly apprehended. If the form were unmeaning Jesus never would have instituted it. It is a reflection on His wisdom to say that he would commission His apostles to teach, and *baptize* all nations, if there is nothing but form in baptism. If there is no meaning in submitting to baptism, Peter, on the day of Pentecost, when asked what those should do who were pricked in their hearts, could not have replied by divine inspiration: “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.” (Acts 2: 38.) The universal practice of the Apostles, and of the early Church in baptizing converts, certainly had other meanings than that of a mere confession of Christ's name before the world, or they would not have taught baptism by water as well as by the Spirit. Confession could as easily have been made in some other form, if confession alone was all there is in it. And

does not Jesus Himself say: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.) What right therefore has any one to ignore baptism as a mere form, without meaning? Surely no one can do so, who understands its spiritual significance as God's act, and not man's. When we are baptized, whether as children or as adults, in the name of the Triune God and by His authority, on the faith of parents, or on our own faith, as responsible agents of the acceptance of its benefits, God receives us into covenant relation with Himself, actually adopts us into His family, and makes us heirs of eternal life. He grants what is symbolized, and sealed by His sacrament; namely the remission of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost, as declared by Peter in the sermon delivered on the day of Pentecost.

"Ah!" says some one who has no faith in the Church or her sacraments, aside from what his subjectivity makes them, "I see you teach baptismal regeneration; you are a Romanist, or at least a High Church Episcopalian." The allegation is gratuitous, and he who makes it does not understand the plain teaching of the Scripture, but, seeing things through his subjective spectacles, is blind to the truth there is in the objective and sacramental. What reason and the Scriptures teach is, not that any one who is baptized, and thus outwardly brought into the Church, is by this means necessarily *regenerated*. Not at all. The outward administration of the sacrament of baptism may be, and no doubt often is, "a savor of death unto death"—a means of our greater condemnation. There are doubtless thousands upon thousands of baptized and communicant members of the Church, who have never been regenerated. They are still "without God and without hope in the world." But, when baptism has been properly administered, and properly received, when it is God's act, and the conditions on which He promises to forgive sin and give the Holy Spirit, are at hand in us, He, by His Holy Spirit, does what is symbolized and sealed by the sacramental transaction.

If we see a sign over a door, representing a boot or a shoe store, it does not mean that there are boots and shoes to be had somewhere ; it means that they are to be had right there, on certain conditions—paying the price. If any one receives a deed to a piece of property, duly signed and sealed, it means that the property is now his in actual fact. The signing and sealing of the papers was necessarily a form, but it means just what it purports to mean. The deed, rightly executed, is an objective reality ; the agreement it represents has binding force upon all the parties.

The same is true in the sacramental covenant, with this difference ; God's covenant is not an agreement between Himself and man, in the sense that we make agreements with each other. We do not dictate any part of the terms of God's covenant. He is the author of it wholly and entirely. We simply comply with its terms and receive its benefits. God makes the covenant, and when He enters into outward and formal covenant with man, through His sacraments, He actually confers the blessings provided and promised in the pardon of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost. Real Scriptural baptism is not the mere application of water to the subject by any mode, in large or small quantity. It is the application of water, in the name of the Triune God, accompanied by the forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

We must not separate what God hath joined. We must not deny or ignore His divine activity in the sacramental transaction. In the Lord's supper, eating bread and drinking wine is not necessarily feeding upon the bread of heaven, or even commemorating the death of Christ. We may thus eat and drink to our condemnation, and hence better not eat and drink at all. But who will say that when we thus eat and drink with penitent, believing heart, with the desire to commemorate Christ's death, and feed upon His broken body and shed blood, we are not given the blessings symbolized and sealed in the Holy Eucharist ? Who will argue that when Jesus instituted His supper and said : " do this in remembrance of me," He meant

that it should be a mere form to be observed at the option of professed disciples? Who will teach from the Scriptures that the Holy sacraments can be set aside at the whim or will of man and no loss be sustained?

But is not this done by many even of those who claim to be teachers sent of God, and who will tell you they are interpreting His word according to its true meaning?

Shall we not then protest against denying or ignoring the objective and sacramental? Is not the danger of Protestantism in this direction? In getting away from the heresy that we are saved by the objective and sacramental, independently of complying with the subjective conditions of salvation, we have swung over too far, and have lost sight of the value of the former: we are trying to be our own saviours, instead of seeking salvation in Christ, and in the way of His ordaining.

We may yield to no one in our appreciation of the spiritual and the experimental, but we should utterly despair of ever being saved, if we were to base our hope on any foundation other than the merit and mediation of Christ.

True faith in Him also compels us to look upon the Church as a divine, objective, living reality—as His body—the bearer of His theanthropic life to us as the mother in whose womb we were begotten by the Holy Ghost, and who gave us spiritual birth—the kingdom where Christ lives and reigns, executing His will among men on earth as well as in heaven—the kingdom of grace where, through sacramental means and heavenly powers, He—the Redeemer, Saviour, and Lord—lifts fallen humanity to the highest possible plane of a heavenly life, and from which we are to be translated to the realm of the glorified life at the end of this probationary state. The faith that identifies Christ and His Church,—in the sense I have tried to show the Scriptures identify them,—will not be a vain faith. It will be a faith bringing forth the best possible fruits of Christian living—a faith that looks away from poor, unworthy, self and utter helplessness to Him whose merit is infinite, and whose obedience

to the law, in all respects met its every demand ; to Him whose triumph over all spiritual foes, even death and the grave, was the triumph of His people, and who is what He is, and did what He did, and is the everliving Mediator—all this for each and all believing disciples. To Him who liveth and reigneth in His Church, prophet, priest and king ; to Him whose name is above every name, and who alone is worthy, be all honor and praise now and forever. AMEN.

V.

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF SACRIFICES.

BY REV. D. B. LADY, A.M.

“ALL Antiquity,” says Ewald, “believed in a God, as every healthy man still does.” An instinct of worship filled the human heart from the beginning. This seems to have found expression in the offer of sacrifices to the Deity. Many statements concerning these, as well as numerous incidental allusions to them are found in the earliest records of the human race.

When we look into the first chapters of Genesis we are met with the information that “the Lord God made for Adam and for his wife coats of skins and clothed them ;” and it has been conjectured by some that these were skins of animals slain for sacrifice. However that may be, we are told, a little further on, that Cain, the first-born son of Adam and Eve, “brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord ;” and that Abel, his brother, “also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof.” Upon coming out of the Ark, it is recorded that Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl and offered burnt offerings on the altar. Afterwards we learn that Abraham journeyed up and down the land of Canaan, and as far as Egypt, and erected altars to the Lord at various places, and that on one occasion, as a trial of his faith, he was called upon to give up his son Isaac as a burnt offering, for whom, however, a ram was afterwards substituted. The reason assigned for the departure of the children of Israel into the wilderness, when

Moses plead with Pharaoh to let them go, was, that they might offer sacrifices to their God.

Among other nations also altars and sacrifices offered thereon are prominent from most remote times. In the Chaldean account of the deluge, set forth on the monuments, as given in Lenormant's "Beginnings of History," we find these words: "I sacrificed a sacrifice. I made the pyre of the holocaust on the peak of the mountain." In the Grecian narratives of the same event, mention is also made of subsequent sacrifices. For example, the people of Samothrace who escaped the destruction are said to have consecrated the entire island by encircling its shores with a girdle of altars dedicated to the gods. In place of the deluge the Egyptian records have a story of the destruction of the first men by the gods on account of their rebellion and their sins, from which the following sentences are taken: "The massacre being accomplished, the anger of Râ is appeased; and he begins to repent of what he has done. He is entirely calmed by a great expiatory sacrifice. Fruits are gathered in every part of Egypt; they are pounded and mixed with human blood, and 7000 jars full are presented before the god." In response the Majesty of Râ said: "It is well this: I shall protect men by reason of this. I raise my hand on this account, to swear that I will no more slay men." After the birth of the priestesses of Amu, the Majesty of Râ said: "'Libations shall be made to him at each of the feasts of the new year under the direction of my priestesses.' Hence it comes that libations are made under the direction of the priestesses of Hat'hor by all men ever since those ancient days."

It is hardly necessary to state the fact that in the Mosaic legislation among the Israelites, great prominence is given to the priesthood, the altar, and sacrifices. Their system of worship was one in which offerings to Jehovah had the principal place. The public sacrifices of animals which the Jewish laws required to be offered each year are summed up in "Nevin's Biblical Antiquities" as follows: "On every day, two lambs; amounting altogether to at least 730. On every Sabbath, two

additional lambs ; making altogether 104. On the first day of every month, two bullocks, one ram, seven lambs, and one goat ; amounting in the year to at least 24 bullocks, 12 rams, 84 lambs and 12 goats. On each of the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread, the same as in the case of every new moon just stated, and besides an additional lamb on the second day with the sheaf of first-fruits ; making altogether 14 bullocks, 7 rams, 50 lambs and 7 goats. On the day of Pentecost, the same also as for each new moon, and besides, with the two wave-loaves, 7 lambs, 1 bullock, 2 rams and a goat, together with 2 other lambs for a sacrifice of peace-offering ; making altogether 3 bullocks, 3 rams, 16 lambs and 2 goats. On the Feast of Trumpets, 1 bullock, 1 ram, 7 lambs and a goat. On the great day of Atonement, the same, and besides a ram and a goat when the high-priest performed his awful duty of entering the Most Holy place ; making altogether 1 bullock, 2 rams, 7 lambs and 2 goats. On each of the eight days of the Feast of the Tabernacles, a number of different victims, equal altogether to 71 bullocks, 15 rams, 105 lambs and 8 goats." Summing up we have a total of "114 bullocks, 40 rams, 1103 lambs and 32 goats." "The blood of all these victims, however," continues Dr. Nevin, "formed only a small part of the whole quantity that was poured forth in the sacred court year after year, from the sacrifices that were there presented before the Lord. The largest stream by far flowed from the various victims that were led to the altar as private offerings." In addition to these bloody sacrifices, there were "Meat Offerings" and "Drink Offerings" of various kinds : "First-Fruits," "First-born," "Tithes," "Vow-gifts," the devotion of the property of an enemy, the half-shekel tax on the occasion of the numbering of the people, and the temple tax in the days of Christ. On occasions of great national importance the number of animals offered in sacrifice was largely increased. When Saul had conquered the Amalekites, he spared the best of the sheep and oxen to be sacrificed unto God. When the temple at Jerusalem was dedicated "an enormous number of sacrifices

was consumed. The king alone offered up twenty-two thousand oxen and one hundred and twenty thousand small cattle solely as a thank-offering, of which all those who took part in the festival might eat if they chose. Many other persons, doubtless, made similar voluntary offerings; and so great was the number of sacrifices that, as the large altar in the inner court did not suffice to receive them, the king was obliged to consecrate for the same purpose the entire space of the fore-court."

It requires but a slight acquaintance with the history and literature of other nations to convince one of the existence among them of systems of worship involving sacrifices quite as numerous and in some respects similar to those in use among the Israelites. In Egypt, in Assyria, among the original inhabitants of Canaan, among other nations with whom the people of God came in contact during the long course of their eventful history and in the flourishing ages of Greece and Rome, sacrifices held a prominent place. Before partaking of wine at the table the pious Greek poured out a portion of what the cup contained as a libation to the gods. It was his "grace before meat." "The Roman family never rose from supper till a portion of the food had been laid on the burning hearth as an offering to the Lares." In the Homeric age the Greeks "offered sacrifices beneath the open vault of heaven, and, like the nations of Canaan, in high places and sacred groves." The funeral rites of Patroclus prove that they sometimes made use of human victims in their worship. Telemachus offers up prayers and libations before setting sail from Lacedæmon to Ithica. About to join the army of Cyrus, Xenophon asked the advice of Socrates, who recommended him to consult the Delphian oracle. He however had determined to go and only asked the oracle to what gods he should sacrifice in order to insure success. In an account of the battle of Marathon, we are told that before the action began, the sacrifices, by which the favor of Heaven was sought and its will consulted, were announced to show propitious omens. And because the Plataeans

had come to the assistance of the Athenians and contributed to the victory on that day, from henceforth, in the solemn sacrifices at Athens, the public prayers were offered up for a joint blessing upon both alike. In the Vedic times in India a cow was sometimes killed as a sacrifice, and goats are still sacrificed to Kali. Kali is the blood-craving goddess. "The blood of one human victim," it is said, "gives her a gleam of pleasure that endures a thousand years; and the sacrifice of three men together, would prolong her ecstasy for a thousand centuries." In Jerusalem, in the time of our Saviour, Pilate had a daily sacrifice offered for the empire and emperor. At the period of St. Paul's visit to Athens, the Agora was filled with statues of her great men, deified heroes and representatives of Mythology; "and in the centre of all was the Altar of the twelve gods, which was to Athens what the Golden Milestone was to Rome." "Every public place and building was likewise a sanctuary." "And as if the imagination of the Attic mind knew no bounds in this direction, abstractions were deified and publicly honored. Altars were erected to Fame, to Modesty, to Energy, to Persuasion, and to Pity." There is frequent mention made in classical authors, of the sacrifice of a Hecatomb—a hundred oxen, in thankfulness for some great victory, or to propitiate some highly offended Deity; and among many primitive tribes and nations, human beings were occasionally sacrificed to the gods.

Whether sacrifices to the gods were in the beginning enjoined upon men by divine command and ordinance, or grew spontaneously out of man's consciousness of his relation to the Deity it is of course impossible, in the absence of any authentic account of their origin, to decide. Nor does it very much matter. No external command which does not have a corresponding law written upon the heart could ever gain any very wide-spread obedience or respect. Human beings are endowed with a sense of the Divine existence and with an aptitude for Divine communion. If God in the first instance demanded sacrifices, man found his heart responding to the demand, and yielded at once, no doubt, a willing obedience thereto. The

universality of sacrifices in the very earliest times and their uninterrupted continuance for thousands of years could not otherwise be accounted for. Even if God did not originally command them to be offered, man must have felt that it would be right to give Him such a service. He had in his heart an impulse towards an adequate recognition of God's existence and a feeling that it would be in accordance with the fitness of things to offer Him some special mark of honor. Such impulse and feeling in this case would find expression in the institution and observance of the sacrifice—a mode of approach to the Divine Being in which the sentiment of worship on the part of man was accustomed to embody itself among all nations in remote times.

It may perhaps be taken for granted that the first feeling in the heart of man towards God was a simple desire to honor Him. It is natural for human beings to respect and reverence those who are their superiors. Men felt that the Divine Being surpassed them in power and in every good and admirable quality, that by reason of His kindness the lines had fallen to them in pleasant places, that He had dealt bountifully with them and given them a goodly heritage, and they sought for some method to please and gratify Him. As they were accustomed to honor one another with gifts it dawned upon them no doubt that gifts might be acceptable to God. This conjecture is borne out by the fact that the original word for sacrifice is *Mincha* (מִנְחָה), which means *a gift, a present, tribute, etc.* And as that which seemed most valuable to men in primitive times, with which they were accustomed to pay tribute to their superiors, consisted of the various stores upon which human life is supported, they came to offer the same as an act of worship to God.

The highest antique religions also show by unmistakable signs that in their origin sacrifices were regarded as "the food of the gods." In Leviticus 21: 8, 17, 21, the sacrifice is called literally, "food of the Deity" (לֶלֶהֶם אֱלֹהִים). The Greeks used not only such expressions as "the Gods feast on Hecatombs," but particular gods bear special surnames indicating the same

thing, such as, *αἰγοφάγος*, the goat-eater, *χριοφάγος*, the ram-eater, Dionysus, *ὠμωστής*, the eater of raw (human) flesh.

At first these gifts of pious worshippers were not consumed by fire. The sacred tree or stone by which the god was supposed to dwell was anointed with the oil or sprinkled with the blood offered to him in sacrifice, whilst libations of milk or wine were poured out beside them. Other food was merely laid upon the ground or upon a rock and left to be devoured by wild animals or otherwise destroyed. The Hebrew offering of the "shew-bread," or "bread of the presence," was of this nature. It was placed upon a table, before the veil which closed the inner sanctuary. After remaining there a week it was removed to be eaten by the priests, while a similar quantity was put in its place. Sacrifices to water-gods were cast into the sea, in harmony with the same general idea.

Afterwards the Deity came to be conceived of as dwelling on high, and as being of a nature too refined and spiritual to partake of the coarse food upon which men sustained their lives. It was then thought that these offerings could be appropriated more readily by Him to whom they were made if they were first etherealized by fire. It was only when the sacrifices had gone upward in fire that they were regarded as complete. Thus it is said of the burnt-offering which Noah made after the flood: "And the Lord smelled the sweet savour; and the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." Men also longed intensely for some sign from above that the sacrifice which they offered was accepted. "And to the childlike feeling of remote Antiquity it appeared that such a sign was met with in fire with its wondrous nature. This, breaking forth, moving, and growing like an unlooked for divine being, and bearing what was devoured aloft in its cloud, seemed to be the means of conveying the earthly gift to heaven." The special sign that a sacrifice was accepted by the Deity was that fire came down from heaven and consumed it. It is thought by some that by this token of divine approval Cain and Abel became aware of the fact that the Lord had respect unto

Abel and to his offering. Instances are given in the history of the Israelites where fire of this miraculous character made its appearance and kindled the wood under the offering. The first sacred fire of the sanctuary under Moses was such: "And there came forth fire from before the Lord and consumed upon the Altar, the burnt-offering and the fat: and when all the people saw it they shouted, and fell on their faces." An angel of the Lord touched with his staff the offering which Gideon had laid upon a rock and fire came out of the rock and devoured it. The Lord answered David by fire when he sacrificed in the threshing floor of Ornan, the Jebusite. The decision of the contest between Elijah and the priests of Baal was made in the same manner. The people of other nations also believed that instances of this kind had occurred among them.

Fire offerings having been introduced, the stone upon which the meal had formerly been set out became a hearth where it was burnt, and afterwards an altar, which came eventually to stand for the general idea of sacrifice, whether what is given is consumed by fire, eaten by the priests, or otherwise used in the service of religion.

The primitive sacrifice by fire was probably the whole burnt-offering or holocaust, in which the gift was entirely made over to God and burnt upon the Altar. Man freely in this sacrifice deprived himself of any share in the sensuous enjoyment of what was offered to God. But his desire was concentrated all the more on this account upon receiving the Divine favor for which the sacrifice was made. Subsequently a form of sacrifice was introduced in which God was regarded as inviting those who made the offering to share with Him the pleasure and enjoyment derived from consuming the food. From that time forward we have the sacrificial feast, where only part of the food is burnt. Among the Arabians this was the blood, with the Greeks, the fat and thighs and a small part of each joint, with the Israelites the blood, the fat and the kidneys. When the offering was made through the instrumentality of a priest, he also received a portion of that which belonged to the Deity, so

that the sacrifice was regarded as shared between God, His servant or minister, and those who brought the gift. In the time of St. Paul, as we learn from one of his epistles, meat which had been offered to idols, was afterwards sold in the markets; indicating that he who made the offering was looked upon as having the privilege of enjoying his portion in a feast or entertainment or of turning it into money, should he be disposed to do so, and enjoying it in some other way.

The primitive inhabitants of the earth were engaged in the cultivation of the soil and the raising of cattle. And just as on this account bread and meat constituted the principal materials of their meals, so the corn and slain offering at an early day entered most largely into sacrifices to the Deity. A very close connection is found to exist between the ancient laws concerning eating and drinking and those concerning sacrifices. This is due to the general principle spoken of before, that the sacrifice was looked upon as a meal for the gods. Whatever was held to be the best meal for human beings was regarded as also constituting a proper sacrifice. And inasmuch as the tendency in all such things is to follow ancient custom cereal and animal offerings with salt and such things as were usually eaten with them, continued through all the centuries to constitute the principal materials of the sacrifice. But as the flesh of animals yielded a more luxurious sacrificial feast, animal sacrifices came, in course of time, greatly to overshadow offerings made up of the products of the fields. Some have also thought that the more powerful and warlike an ancient nation became the more it learned to love the bloody sacrifice; and they account in this way for the gradual preponderance of animal offerings over all others. Whether for one or both these reasons, the history of religion plainly indicates that the fruits of agriculture gave way more and more to the use of animals whose blood was sprinkled upon or poured out before the Altar, upon which the whole or a part of its flesh was afterwards consumed. The corn-offering, especially among the Israelites, gradually fell into the background and became a mere accompaniment of the more imposing animal sacrifice.

The first sacrifices offered by men to God, were no doubt of a general character, the main purpose in men's minds, so far as they had become aware of it, being to honor Him and to come into relations of friendliness and communion with Him. Desirous of showing their gratitude for the blessings of the harvest and the increase of their cattle, as well as for other favors, they brought of the first fruits of their ingatherings and of the firstlings of their flocks as offerings to the Lord. Eager to retain His favor, to enjoy a continuance of His benedictions upon their enterprises and His help in their undertakings, they added numerous additional gifts. These offerings were an expression of the feelings called into exercise and voiced in a modern service of prayer and praise.

The earliest ages of human history were full of joy and hope, as is the case with the early years of every properly conditioned individual human life now. A sense of Divine goodness filled the hearts of men. The Deity was regarded as the friend of man. He had given him many evidences of His favor. He was ready to help him in all his well considered aims. Thus the sacrifice was offered in a joyous and grateful spirit, with full confidence in the benevolent disposition of the Deity towards him who offered it, and with a belief in "that reciprocity between heaven and earth, between God and man, which ever constitutes the final ground of all religion." There may have been involved in the sacrifice, also, as men looked upon it, the thought of expiation. But a sense of sinfulness, and the idea that the Deity might be offended with him seems not primarily to have had much place in human consciousness. Hence the thought of covering or wiping out his guilt did not originally enter very largely into the idea of sacrifices. These were therefore at first mainly of the kind which the Romans called *honorific*.

But as the centuries passed by, as disasters overtook individuals and tribes and nations, and men became more thoughtful, the childhood of the race giving place to the sober reflection characteristic of mature manhood, men began to feel that they

were out of harmony with God. It dawned on their minds that the Divine displeasure rested upon them. They realized that God's good-will had been forfeited. Gloom and wretchedness filled their hearts. They groaned under the burden of their guilt. They felt that God was angry with them, that His countenance was withdrawn from them, that they were debarred from intercourse with Him. And it became a matter of the utmost importance with them to find some way to propitiate the wrath of the Almighty. Sacrifices now came to be offered in order to secure the reconciliation of God to men. Offerings were made that the lost favor of God might be regained, and that men might be restored to relations of friendliness with Him. The expiatory or piacular sacrifice came, at this stage, to be differentiated from the thanksgivings and prayer offering. And for the expiatory offering the animal sacrifice seemed peculiarly fitting.

In meditating upon their guilt, men came to feel that their lives with all those blessings from above which alone make life valuable, had become forfeited to God on account of sin. Among ancient nations the life was looked upon as having its seat in the blood. "The life (or soul) of the flesh is in the blood." "The blood is the life." The blood was therefore regarded, in view of the forfeiture of their lives by reason of sin, as the only proper offering to set men right with God. It was the highest, best, most sacred thing which they could offer Him. There was something mysterious and awful in it. When once shed, in the case of animal or man, the life went out. It was like water spilled upon the ground; it could not be gathered up again. When this wonderful and valuable thing was wholly surrendered to God in sacrifice, with the earnest entreaty that He would accept of it, the offerer could believe that this had taken place. "This belief in a gracious acceptance on the part of God," says Ewald, "is the very kernel and centre of the whole act of sacrifice." The offering of the blood—the life of the animal was thus the expression, in its best and most intense form, of man's desire for the re-establishment of inter-

course and communion with God; and it served as nothing else could, to awaken faith that this intercourse was vouchsafed him. It renewed confidence in the Divine favor. By means of it man was assured of reconciliation to God and the salvation of his soul. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the Altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." (Lev. 17: 11). In such sacrifices the carcass of the victim, among the Greeks, was buried or cast into the sea, and among the Israelites in most cases it was burned without the camp, as were also the children offered to Moloch. In other cases it became a holocaust on the altar, as in that instance of the king of Moab who sacrificed his son, the heir to the throne, as a burnt offering upon the wall, to avert the total annihilation of his army at the hands of the kings of Israel, Judah and Edom.

Two ideas were involved in the atoning sacrifice in which a life was offered to the Deity. The first is that of substitution. This is prominent in all early religions, says Prof. W. Robertson Smith. Spartan lads, instead of being wholly immolated, were merely flogged at the altar of Artemis Orthia. The priests of Baal, in their prayer contest with Elijah on Mount Carmel, "cried aloud and cut themselves after their manner, with knives and lances, till the blood gushed out upon them," (1 Kings 18: 28), giving only part of the blood for the whole of it or for the life. The Romans offered puppets, instead of human sacrifices, to Mania, and cast rush dolls into the Tiber at the yearly sacrifice on the Sublician bridge. Usually an animal was substituted for a human being. Among the Egyptians the victim was marked with a seal, bearing the image of a man bound and kneeling, with a sword at his throat. The same thought comes out in a striking event in the history of the ancestor of the Jewish race, the sacrifice of his son Isaac. "And Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in the thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt

offering in the stead of his son." There was among the heathen nations as well as among the Israelites a ceremony which represented the laying of the sin of which the one who brought the offering felt himself to be guilty upon the animal set apart as an offering. We have a full description of it in the regulations concerning the scapegoat. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness, and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a solitary land." (Lev. 16: 21, 22).

The second idea involved in the animal sacrifice is that of a re-established covenant or relationship of friendship or brotherhood between man and God. In very ancient times, as is the case even now among tribes and nations where primitive customs have been most tenaciously adhered to, men made leagues of friendship with one another by drinking one another's blood or by a transfusion of blood. This transaction was known by the term, "drinking the covenant." It is described at length and illustrated by many examples in Trumbull's "Blood Covenant." Among other methods of entering into a covenant was that of offering a sacrifice, the blood of which, if not actually tasted, was touched by, or sprinkled upon, both parties to the transaction and upon the image or altar of the god who was supposed to preside over the contract and who invested it with a sacredness which it could not otherwise have had. The ceremony was concluded with a sacrificial feast. "From this point of view," says Prof. Smith, "the sacramental rites of mystical sacrifice are a form of blood covenant, and serve the same purpose as the mixing of blood or tasting of each other's blood by which in ancient times two men or two clans created a sacred covenant bond." Such a covenant was made between God and Abraham. "And he said, O Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it? And He said unto him, Take

me a heifer of three years old, and a she goat of three years old, etc. . . . In that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram." Such a covenant was also made between Jehovah and the Israelites at the promulgation of the moral law. "And Moses took half the blood and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the Altar" (which represented Jehovah,) "And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do and be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." After this Moses and Aaron and the Elders of Israel went up into the presence of the Lord and did eat and drink. In coming to a sense of the fact that they were guilty in the sight of God, men came to feel also that the bond of friendship originally existing between themselves and the Divine Being was broken. Perhaps they had a dim remembrance or at least a tradition of that happy period, now long since past, when God walked with men in their earthly dwelling places and held delightful and strengthening communion with them. At all events they longed to come into relations of friendship and a common life with Him. And this they regarded as being brought about by the sacrifices which they offered and the ceremonies connected with them. "In the higher forms of sacrifice," says Trumbull, "on the basis of the root idea of the primitive rite of the covenant of blood, an inter-union is symbolized between the returning sinner and his God." Edersheim says of all the various sacrifices of the Jewish ritual: "These were either sacrifices of communion with God, or else intended to restore that communion when it had been disturbed or dimmed through sin and trespass." "We see then," says W. Robertson Smith, "that the ultimate form of the atoning ritual, as it is found in the day of atonement, is a combination of many different points of view—satisfaction to the judge at the sanctuary, *the renovation of a covenant of life with God*, and the banishment of sin from His presence and land."

In many of the honorific as well as in some of the piacular sacrifices, whilst the blood was poured out before the altar, or sprinkled upon it in particular cases, only part of the carcase was consumed by fire, the other parts coming back to him who made the offering and being eaten in a sacrificial feast. In the Jewish Passover the lamb was roasted and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs by the family or company which offered it. It was as though God invited those who had secured His favor through an acceptable offering, or to whom He had been reconciled by means of an expiatory sacrifice, to share with Him in a common meal. There was communion and intercourse here between men and their God as a result of the sacrifice. He gave them food to eat. He communicated strength to them and nourished and sustained their life. Among other nations this idea was carried still farther. Certain deities were regarded as being of kin to the nation which worshiped them, and also to a certain animal among them. Once or twice a year this animal was offered in sacrifice to the god. Being of kin to the worshippers its death was looked upon as a murder. In the Attic Diipolia the sacrificial axe, thrown away by the priest, was taken and tried for murder and condemned. But the sacred animal also shared the nature of and represented the god, who thus died for his people. In this case the body is not burned or buried or cast away, but both flesh and blood are eaten by the worshippers, so that the life of the god passes into their lives and knits them to him in living communion. "In the Diipolia at Athens, 'the dead was raised again in the same sacrifice,' as the mystic text had it: the skin was sewed up and stuffed and all tasted the sacrificial flesh; so that the life of the victim was renewed in the lives of those who ate of it."

(✓✓

Considering the strict and minute regulations which had been established with regard to the manner of making the offerings among the Israelites it is not surprising that this duty was often performed in a mechanical and perfunctory manner by men who had no sense of their true meaning, or lacked the

feeling which alone constituted them religious acts properly so called. The prophets in later times often reproved the people for such formality, and pointed out the fact that God had no need of such things. "To obey is better than sacrifice," said Samuel to Saul, "and to hearken than the fat of rams." "If I were hungry I would not tell thee." God is represented as saying in the 50th Psalm: "For the world is mine and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High." "For thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it," says the Psalmist in the 51st Psalm. "Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." These and similar passages in the later literature of Israel may be regarded as entering into expressions of regret for sins too high-handed and presumptuous to be atoned for by the established sacrifices, and also as foreshadowing the time when, in the higher religion of Christianity, to which all ancient systems of Divine worship are to give place, the blood of animals should be no longer shed for sin, but when the penitent sinner, having found acceptance with God through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, should bring to him the more pleasing offering of a pure and grateful and obedient life. Similar thoughts are found also in heathen authors. Porphyry quotes from an earlier writer, as we learn from Dr. Edwin Hatch in the *Ency. Brit.* these striking words: "We ought, then, having been united and made like to God, to offer our own conduct as a holy sacrifice to Him, the same being also a hymn and our salvation in passionless excellence of soul." The tendency after the exile, during which time it is presumed no sacrifices were offered, was to dissociate personal religion more and more from the sacrifices, and to connect it with the worship of the synagogue, the reading of the Scriptures and private approaches to God in prayer, thus preparing the way for the New Testament.

The sacrifice, in existence as far back as the records of the race extend, whether technically of Divine or human origin,

was a real approach on the part of man toward God. In and through these strikingly significant and sometimes solemn and even awful forms of worship, man gave utterance to his profoundest religious feelings, viz.: gratitude for Divine favor, an earnest desire for its continuance, a deep sense of his sinfulness and his need of reconciliation with his judge, his longing for a restoration to friendship with God, lost through transgression, and a communion which should secure to him the highest blessings which he is capable of receiving. And may we not believe also that God responded to these earnest and persevering efforts to attain to spiritual communion with Himself, and bestowed upon the pious and sincere worshipper of every century of man's history the pardon of his sins and eternal life?

The human race makes successive strides in its efforts to realize the possibilities of good which lie within the scope of its nature. "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs." By reason of this fact the achievements of one period may become types of those which are to follow in a succeeding period. What was sought after, but only partly reached in the ancient sacrifices is fully realized in the great expiatory offering of Jesus Christ upon the cross. In Him the human family yields up to God in a sacrifice of thanksgiving the noblest and best it has been able to produce—the very flower and ripe fruit of its history. He, the Son of Man, is offered that Divine blessings may be secured for mankind. He, a substitute for the sinner, becomes an atoning sacrifice to cover and wipe out human sinfulness—"the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." He is our great peace-offering, and in a holy communion—a true sacrificial feast, we sit at His table and partake of the offering as the bread of God. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." In Christ is realized a communion which was, as coming to view in their sacrificial worship and in the supreme longings of their hearts after communion with God and a share in His life, the desire of all nations.

VI.

HYMNOLOGY AND MUSIC IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

BY REV. J. M. SCHICK, D.D.

WHAT is a hymn? What may be called music? What constitutes Christian worship?

I am satisfied that immortality awaits the man, who shall define these terms, and describe their limitations and relations to each other, in such a way as to satisfy both the critics and the facts in the case at the same time.

But with immortality, so apparently within easy reach, I am too fully satisfied with the enormity of such an undertaking, and, too fully aware of the impossibilities in the case, to grasp at it. I shall hesitate before venturing very far into this inviting field, where others have been lost in their explorations, and you will pardon me when I announce that I mean to keep very near to the fence in this paper.

I am reminded that that most excellent of definers, who defined a hymn to be "a song with praise to God," and added, to make the matter plain, "if there be song and you do not praise God, you do not call it a hymn," got into the ridiculous position of writing hymns, whose object was to counteract the heretical hymns of the Donatists. These he did not hesitate to call hymns. But it had to be done praise or no praise, for the people would sing heresy when orthodoxy was out of reach.

And I have known some since Augustine's day, who knew just exactly what a hymn was, and, where it belonged in Christian worship, sing hymns without ascriptions of praise to God directly, and enjoy them too.

I am willing to confess at the very beginning that I have tried this defining business, in this connection and invariably found similar difficulties besetting me. Now, if there were no ugly facts to harass a body, one could easily say what a hymn or true music is. But by the time I have settled the question that such hymns as "There is a Happy Land" are not hymns at all, being only songs about heaven, I catch myself singing, with a heart full of love to Christ, the glory of it, "Jerusalem the golden with milk and honey blest." And then, after I explained to my Sunday-school the impropriety of singing in worship "Work for the night is coming," my monitor reminded me that only last Sunday I had had the congregation sing, "Ye servants of the Lord each in his office wait,"—and had selected it myself. And I am about fully convinced that the priest who sings, "Come ye disconsolate," has no good ground to stand upon, when he criticises the preacher who sings, perhaps not so musically, but awfully effectively, "Come ye sinners poor and needy."

With fullest appreciation of this fact, this work is undertaken, and if occasionally the writer seems to have a disposition to define or describe hymns or music, it must be attributed to that most common tendency in the very nature of our humanity that leads men to seek, what others have decided unfindable. Excellent mathematicians, you know, have tried to square the circle; and, not a few really good mechanics have wasted time in the search for perpetual motion; and even Christopher Columbus attempted a westward trip to the East Indies, and found, well, you know, he forgot to continue his investigations as soon as he saw America.

A most interesting introduction to the discussion of the subject of hymnology and music in relation to Christian worship, would most naturally be a review of the music of the Hebrews in connection with the Psalms of the Old Testament, the hymnology of the Jews. For, whatever be the opinions entertained, respecting the use of hymns and music in Christian worship, on one point there can be no difference of opinion, viz.,

that the first hymns of the Christian Church, both as to words and tunes were the Psalms of the old covenant.

But, however proper and fitting such a procedure would be, we are hindered by the difficulty, so common in careful investigations, that nobody seems to know much about the music of the Hebrews. No instance of musical annotation has been found among the antiquities of the Jews. This, however, does not prevent writers from indulging in a world of guessing on this subject, and one will have but little difficulty to find authority for almost any view he may hold in the premises.

It seems as if the standpoint, from which the investigator starts his search, determines his conclusions. If one believes that "music and poetry ever move hand and hand with equal step," for the two are practically inseparable, and, in the light of this connection, proceeds to consider Jewish music, he is compelled to find that the Jews had music of the richest, grandest character to express the emotions found living in the psalms—so vast in their wealth of feeling, devotion, adoration, penitence, comfort, passion; so rich in imagery, description, example; so really human, and, yet so near the bourns of the divine; and, so deep in spiritual wisdom, that nothing short of absolutely sublime music could be deemed a proper means to carry them outward, upward.

And this view is supported by the evidences of the great attention paid to the culture of music, and the use made of it in the service of the tabernacle and temple. So that, with all the recorded evidences at hand, no one can help accepting the conclusion that the devotional music of the Jews was a very highly developed art.

But if the investigator start with the instruments, which had to make this grand music, he must at least scratch his head or stretch his imagination, to a very high degree. Yet no honest investigator does either. He never does. So when he sees a harp with from three to twelve strings at most, an organ capable of making from four to seven tones, trumpets and horns capable of producing only such variety of tones, as

the musician could make by the way he blew the blast, high or low, soft or hard ; drums and cymbals of single tones only ; he in his severe honesty strips the music of its charms, and insists that the Jews had very simple music—though at times, as he is willing to admit, they had lots of it.

However, since definite determination is impossible, we are left in the mists, between Delitzsch, who insists that the music of the Hebrew was never more than a cantillation ; and Herder, who believes that the poetry of the Psalms acquired “new power, a more graceful movement and greater harmony of sound” from the *music* itself ; with Professor Jahn between, straddling the chasm, by saying that music was very highly cultivated, and, at the same time, admitting that by some it might be regarded very noisy, and suggesting, that this is after all a matter of taste. It may, therefore, be well for all to lay a milder stress upon the emphasis with which the guesses of others are combated, and together rejoice that whether the music were grand or common, complex or simple, it, together with the Psalms of the old covenant, formed the basis of that form of Christian worship, which, with occasional exception, has been the means of expressing, in rapturous outbursts the religious life of believers in every age, and, by which, in the weary days of the earthly pilgrimage, the heart of the faithful heavenly citizen has ever been able to enjoy foretastes of the delights of that worship in the home country, where, undisturbed by knowledge of sin or consciousness of imperfections, the whole company of the redeemed shall unite in unceasing praise to the Lord of man’s salvation.

This, however, should be said : If music was a highly developed art in the days of Israel, it was lost afterward, and at the time of our Saviour’s advent, song had a new birth from above. The music and hymn of the synagogue no doubt was the first music of the Church, but very soon there was developed a body of Christian hymns. Traces of these are found in what seem to be quotations in the Epistles and in Revelation. At any rate we early find a body of hymns clustering around the

incarnation as if the Church had caught the keynote from the angels' song. After the hymns and fragments in the New Testament, we find frequent mention made that the apostles sang praises together, and St. Paul enjoins believers to speak to each other in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, making melody in their hearts to God. From this it must be inferred that there was much singing; and very early many hymns were indited and used by the Church. But of the tunes we lack information, except that St. Augustine says of the music that it was more a speech than a song.

Here it is that regrets crowd upon us, because we find no scores of the tunes, but when the soul is full of praise the grateful heart must find expression in some form. It may be the hymns were sung to the tunes of the secular world, for it is noteworthy that, when the soul is most moved, it is possible to lay hold of and sanctify what otherwise would be almost profane. So in the Reformation days, when we have come to the time when tunes and hymns are preserved for us, we know full well that frequently the Church stole from the devil, as it were, and used with changes in words the profane and even licentious tunes of the world. This would, at any rate, not be the only instance in which the Church converted the profane to sacred uses, and lifted the worldly heavenward.

However that may be, and whatever the character of the music might have been, the number of hymns constantly increased. The unfolding of the conscious Christian life began to express itself, and the joy of heart found means to indite itself for others, and soon a body of hymns was given to the Church for its use. There are differences of opinion as to their merit. But they were used and enjoyed in their day. From these beginnings grew the great body of hymnology of our Christianity, the extent of which it would be a difficult matter to even conceive.

Every age has its own hymns. These satisfy the devotional necessities of the time in which they were born. Most of them being peculiar to their own age, die early. And, come to think

of it, what a blessing that is! A few outlive their time. Impressed with the Spirit of the Christ that gave them birth, they live in all ages and are used in all times. These are the old hymns ever new. Of them no one tires. They bring into our lives the inspiration of other days, and they are sung as our fathers sang them. The spirit of worship they express will ever keep them living so long as devotion shall be a form of expressing the Christian life.

But it would be sheerest folly to even try to compass, in this paper, in any detail, this body of hymnology. Who would be able to go round this world in forty minutes? It could not be done, if one were to go spinning from peak to peak as they rise above the mountain chains that traverse the hymn world at a rate that even Verne never dreamed of.

It will be more to the purpose if we consider that, whilst every age in the life of the Church was productive of more or less hymns, and, perhaps, no age was really without some one being inspired, to lead the singers yet those times were most productive which were times of active soul life. When men's hearts were tried. When the reality of the life in man sent his blood pulsing through his veins and brought him to a conscious realization of both his need and help. These were always times when the hymn-making power was especially active. It was when heresy and heretical disturbances quickened the heart throbs of Ephrem Syrus and St. Augustine that their love of the truth, as they saw it, fired their hearts into songs. So it was when the whole soul life of Germany was stirred to its very inmost depths that there broke out that volume of devotional hymnology that marks the reformation as distinctly as any other characteristic that might be named. For the spirit of the times is deeply impressed upon the hymns themselves, so fully as to make them a history of the era.

So, too, it will be found that when an individual wrote a hymn—one that lives, I mean,—it generally was “an outburst of religious life,” the product of some occasion in which the heart spoke more than the intellect, and this it is

which gives hymns such a fascination and the study of them such a charm, and perhaps it explains why in one age the hymn writer could be so truly orthodox, and why in another so absolutely a nonconformist.

In the manner of singing these hymns, there seems also to be a development from an apparently very simple beginning. As already mentioned the music of the first days of the Church's history must have been quite rudimentary, and most likely quite destitute of harmony. The melodies must have been such as were easily learned and kept in memory. For notation of music came much later. All the older music was simple and learned by repetition, and such a course would have precluded much that is now required in good music. Often one person sang and the people joined in the refrain; at other times, all sang. But this seems to have been about all the variety which singing afforded at the beginning of our era. Then Ignatius introduced the Antiphon at Antioch. There is a tradition which attributes this step to a vision, in which Ignatius saw the angels singing hymns to the Holy Trinity after this manner. This was the beginning of the Ambrosian chant, for when Ambrose visited Antioch he was moved to introduce the same plan of singing at Milan. He used, instead of the unisonal mode in vogue before him, the four authentic modes, with such effect that Augustine, speaking of the hymns and canticles he had heard, says: "The voices flowed into my ears, the truth instilled into my heart, I overflowed with devout affection and was happy." He also says that this custom of singing was introduced "lest the people would get weary" very much, I suppose, as we would sing "From Greenland's icy mountains" between the speeches at a missionary meeting. Then Gregory of Rome a couple of centuries later added the plagal modes for chanting purposes and gave us the Gregorian chants.

With the reformation began the use of the choral, which grew into our metrical tunes and other modern manners of singing to the praise of God.

From this outline it is easy to see that the singing varied from time to time. For the most part it remained under the conduct or, at least, direction, of the professional singers, and I may here remark, parenthetically, that this matter of song has given the Church a great deal of trouble. Not only now, but almost from the beginning the people would sing. The singing would not always be orthodox for the ecclesiastics, nor correct according to the canons or singers. At one council, (Laodicea), it was expressly ordained that none but canons should presume to sing in church. I guess they must have had trouble with the people who dragged the music or who could not keep the tunes to suit the singers, and the church to keep the peace was compelled to side with the canons. This is only mentioned in passing, for the comfort of any brother who finds his choir "one too many" for him.

Another peculiarity of the earlier singing was the trouble the heretics made. They would sing. They were not so very particular, as were the churchmen, about the entire correctness of the music. They were ideal hearts for the musician, being freer than the orthodox. Athanasius called the music light and condemned the hymns as improper. But condemning never corrected a wrong, and heretical singing and processions were very frequent, so much so that, in his day, Chrysostom tried to mend matters. He inaugurated orthodox processional hymn singing, with great pomp and good intentions. And when the two processions, orthodox and heretic would meet singing their hymns of praise to God, bloodshed and riot would frequently succeed to His greater glory. So God used the foolishness of man to praise Him, for whatever else resulted music developed.

Since music as well as poetry gives expression to emotion, it would be natural to expect that they would soon adapt themselves to each other. But one of the great difficulties with the music of worship seems to be the adaptation of tunes to hymns. What versions of music for given hymns have crowded upon the world. Each musician seems to see where the others have failed, and then he has great trouble to make other people see it.

Very early explicit directions were given to singers: of course when the modes and tunes used were few the directions were simple enough: that solemn hymns should be sung very slowly and with subdued voice and hymns of rejoicing with swift measure and loud voice. Then when the various scales had been introduced by Gregory, the development was such that certain keys as the modern C. Major was by Pope John XVI denounced as lascivious and proscribed from use in the Sanctuary. Especially did he forbid the use of the voluptuous harmony of 3ds and 6ths as fit only for profane use. What is the proper music for a given hymn? is a question long confronting the Church. So it was when the old choral music seemed established, but when the multiplication of hymns, in our ordinary English metres, took place, we find tunes multiplying as rapidly, and a little later, more rapidly, until a perfectly bewildering assortment of music books, with tunes for worship confronted every one as soon as a hymn was announced to be sung, and, as no one seemed to have any positive authority to decide, all sorts of tunes were sung to all sorts of hymns, except that a few being especially well adapted to each other seemed to come into use by a sort of common, or rather uncommon, consent as given to each other. But most tunes, like most hymns, filled a place in the book and with that their mission ended, while others expressing true or proper sentiments lived to become standard and these form a body of music from which selections of tunes are really made.

Latterly (since say 1860) a different tendency has been pursued. A sort of differentiation and synthesis. Individuals, and then churches, made collections of hymns and tunes, adapted to each other for use in worship, and so settled for themselves, at least, the question as to what are proper hymns or tunes to be used together, and this perhaps will be followed by a greater elimination later on. How many failures occurred no one may know. Tastes do differ. One man's choice is another man's special rejection. But even with all this it cannot be but that great good must come from these collections, which, if the proper care has been exercised, must at least give

each hymn some proper tune, and, as the church becomes familiar with them, it cannot be otherwise than that the people will know and use them. And this is after all the real use of hymn and tune in the service, that the people shall find in these the means of expressing the feelings of devotion, with which they would worship.

The purpose of music is not to create the emotion, only to awaken and express it. No martial music can make a coward brave; but by it a brave man is incited to deeds of daring even when the bravery must first be called out by the same music. So, by the service of song, in the sanctuary the believer's heart may be quickened into ascriptions of devotion and praise. But the music would be powerless to have the same result in the unbeliever's ear.

Whatever else may be said about hymns and music in worship there is one thing never to be forgotten, and that is, that the very idea of such use implies that all the people sing. "Let all the people praise Thee." Where the people allow one to sing, or where the singing is resigned to a few, and the congregation becomes a body of listeners, the idea of worship must in reality give place to that of entertainment, and as this is so largely an age of entertainment, it will not be wasted time to emphasize, as strongly as possible, that no part of the service can be devoted to the entertainment or enjoyment of the worshipper. For in proportion as the people make prominent the individual enjoyment, do they turn the worship into a service for themselves rather than for God. It is because so many seek for entertainment that much of the difficulty in this form of worship has been developed. Then members of the choir may grow jealous of each other, and the criticisms of the people begin to count. Then the choir must be paid and strangers invited to hear it, and we must have the finest in town and Sunday evening, especially, must be more entertaining than a sermon can make it, and more attractive than the ordinary service would permit, hence all is changed for a song service, a sort of an entertainment or sacred concert to draw the people to the

church. What for? Shall the character of the Church and its service be changed only to entertain the people? If this tendency be not corrected only evil can result, no matter how excellent the singing may be.

It should be forever settled that when a congregation of Christians assembles for worship all features of entertaining the worshipper are totally out of place, whether they are presented from the pulpit, at one end of the Church, or choir loft at the other.

It has long been a settled point as respects praying, then why not for the singing as well?

We are all ready to insist that prayer can be made to God only, and would condemn any one who should attempt the ridiculous idea of praying to affect the sinner, or to comfort the saint, as the object of the prayer. That a prayer may be effective for these ends and in many others is not to be denied. But that is not a prayer which is offered to the saint or sinner in the hour of his need. This is understood. No one thinks of inviting any one to church to enjoy the preacher's prayer, nor of being benefited by it. The very same should be true of the singing.

As soon as the idea of entertainment is given up, the participation of every one in the service will follow as a consequence. All owe a debt of praise and each one will have as really a personal part in the ascription of praise as would be had in almsgiving and prayer; and whatever shall help to make this plain will be useful in developing the devotional spirit of the congregation. No voice should be silent in the service song any more than in confession of faith, for instance, and never would be if it were not for the desire to be in keeping with the artistic development of the rest of the world.

We have our ideas of art. A standard is set up and this standard is generally set to the highest notch of our musical education or musical instructors' dicta.

But the trouble lies here. The circle of those who can understand or appreciate this music is so very small; and it can be noticed that in every circle there are a few who can see a

little farther into the possibilities or impossibilities of the art than the others. These form a still narrower circle of real musicians. No one, who pretends to musical taste, is willing to risk his musical reputation by daring to say that the appreciation of this class of music is beyond his æsthetic ability. Hence the narrower the circle the greater the authority in matters of music. At the end of the eliminations one can easily imagine a virtuoso so refined as to be made nervous by any music except that so classic as to be beyond the comprehension of any body else. Now, as the very highest perfection is aimed at in the music of the sanctuary, this one, unfortunately, is called upon to select the music best adapted to the truer expression of the religious emotions of the worshippers. And these, forsooth, sit in subdued silence, whilst the thoroughly trained singers praise God for them in the use of music, so classic, that most could not appreciate or understand it, and so refined that not one in the congregation could execute it, if one could be found bold enough to try. Excuse me, but I don't believe in any such nonsense. It may do very well for music as music, but as the handmaid of religion to assist the congregation in its devotions, such music can only be absolute failure.

This is not a plea for a lower standard in music, but for a different one. It will not do to call music good simply because we do not understand it well enough to call it bad. It is easy to fall into such an error. A good story illustrating this kind of wisdom, in another sphere, is told by Bro. E. N. Kremer of a Welsh preacher, with a good endowment of native wit,—who captured a congregation, which could be satisfied with only the most erudite preaching, by quoting in his trial sermon Latin, Greek and Hebrew, to the admiration of the people who understood neither the Welsh he used, nor the other languages he did not use, and for which he had substituted the Welsh.

The standard of measurement for music, in worship, cannot be a poor one, and yet, I cannot get away from the idea, that music, which prevents the participation of the people in the worship, is poor music for service in the church.

It is not the province of this paper to discuss music as an art in its relation to devotional inspiration in the sanctuary. It cannot be doubted, that it has a sphere in which its highest development can be useful in the service of the Church as fully as painting, sculpture, architecture. It certainly seems reasonable, that this art, which has the most authentic assurance of immortality, which from the beginning into eternity, in the perfection of the heavenly world has a place in the adoration of saints and angels, and, which has been a means of communication with man from the unseen world, should find some way in which to use its highest beauty, as an instrument of sublimest grandeur, as an ornament to the worship, in some such order as the other arts have found their way, to elevate the mind, to awaken in the soul the spirit of truest devotion and lead, as it were, the worshipper into the holy of holies of Christian service.

No other art has been so prolific in results for pleasure, for war, for sensuality. None has contributed so much to awaken passion and natural delight, and it cannot be, but that, in the fuller and truer development of its use, there is, for music, a sphere equally as effective for awakening spiritual emotions in the service of the Church as the embodiment of real Christianity. But the demonstration of that sphere really belongs to the Christian musicians, who recognize the problem and are even now doing something towards its solution.

Only, that sphere cannot be the ordinary praise of the ordinary worshipper. Here, as elsewhere, the carnal mind is enmity toward God. For the fact is, that for a very large proportion of every congregation, a too highly refined musical art is destructive to devotional participation. And the real truth must be recognized, that the number of such as can enter into the spirit of the so-called, highly developed musical composition is in any given congregation very small.

The character, therefore, of both the music and words of the hymn to be used in worship should be within the capacity of the people.

Any one can see that a hymn, composed of words, which cannot be comprehended by the mind, would be useless as a means to worship, no matter how true to the laws of language it might be in its composition. And equally useless must the tune be, that cannot be sung by the worshippers.

Of course music, intended to be used in worship, cannot be less than good. The laws governing proper melody, and true harmony, are ever to be observed, and nothing less than the very best can be regarded with any toleration in worship. Only there should be no misunderstanding as to the best. And it seems rational, to use as one of the factors in determining what is best, the purposes for which the music is intended. The mere fact that the music is in correct taste, or that it, in some degree, approaches an ideal, cannot determine its proper character for use in worship. Especially is this true when such approaches to the ideal involve great musical ability, on the part of the worshipper, who attempts to join in the devotional act.

The tendency of very high standards of musical skill in the composition of hymn tunes is to reduce the general participation in congregational singing, in other ways than the one indicated above.

For instance, the spirit which criticises those, who cannot attain success in executing the complex achievements attempted in the composition, is generated, both because every slight departure from the score grates on the sensitive ear of the musician, and by right of the latter's ability, it is allowed him to relieve himself or his injured musical instincts, by pointing out the fact that somebody's tenor was too sharp, or another's bass too flat. And yet it is fair to insist that no one has the right or privilege to sit in judgment, and especially critical judgment, over the devotional acts of another. No man dares to lay his critical hand upon the mouth of any honest worshipper, whose heart finds expression in a song of praise, because forsooth his tones have a nasal twang, or because he is a little sharp or flat, for the other singers, who are always in tune,

even if less devotional. He cannot sing the hymns to suit the choirs and is silent.

Again, the music expresses a sentiment, and the melody carries this sentiment for most people. But a good musician, who fully understands music, sees the possibility of making the expression still more complete in the fuller development of the idea in the arrangement of the parts constituting the harmony. In his hand, harmony is not intended to sustain the original melody, but each part without any violation of the laws of harmony becomes a part in itself, and four melodies are mingled, and the original melody expresses the sentiment in connection with three others at the same time. The musician is happy over the result, and the ordinary untrained singer wonders what in the world is the matter with the old tune he used to love so well. He doesn't sing as loudly as he did before, and after a few unsuccessful efforts to get the run of the tune gives it up, and he too joins the grand army of silent singers.

So this tendency could be demonstrated forward through other phases, but all of them alike show the same result, that it is too largely true, that in proportion as the singing of the choir becomes more artistic, the voices of the people are silenced until in many churches congregational singing is almost a positive curiosity.

This perhaps may also be an explanation which accounts for the great popularity of the much condemned and yet frequently sung modern, light music. It does not live long. But it does awaken emotion, and, whenever used, is sung by a large proportion of the people assembled. In much of it there is no true expression of devotion. And this is the case both with music and words. But the artistic standard permits of general participation, and all can sing without the least danger of offending the ear of any of the other singers.

Now while I have little sympathy for popular music, and none for the latter-day so-called spiritual songs, designated spiritual songs, because even their own authors would not dare to call them hymns, and, in truth, there is too frequently as

little of the spiritual as there is of the hymn in the song. Yet I can see that there is in the simplicity of the arrangement of the music something which, because of its effect in awakening the devotional spirit, and in calling forth a full participation, suggests to those who are anxious for the real devotional hymns the possibility of a sacred music which shall be at once simple in composition and pure in character, and yet, so grand in movement as to lift the soul heavenward as it were, and both awaken and express the emotions of true worship. This, at least, the music, which has displayed so much scientific refinement, has not done in a way to allow more than a meagre few to enter into.

After all is said the truest art in music, in its proper sphere, is that which is free and not bound to any law other than this, that it may become "the medium and breath of the common devotions of the people," and the very fact of its simplicity of arrangement must always be proof positive of its high artistic standard.

Here the question may arise, whether it be better to educate the people up to the requirements of scientific refinement in church music. So much is said about this by the musicians. But we are confronted with another question. Can it be a legitimate object of the service to educate a congregation in this art? To state the question is to show the difficulty. There is no question but that the education will be effected in time. Congregations have been educated up and down in a great many ways as the history of the Church sufficiently shows. But it will hardly do for that reason to turn the act of worship into an art school to elevate the taste for music.

And yet, for all this, even if the opinion of the writer prevails, and it is accepted that the use of hymns and music in worship legitimately requires that general participation which the paper indicates, the fact confronts us that the singing cannot be poor. Improvement is certainly necessary. Not only is it a need that all should sing in worship, but that singing, in

all its freedom, dare not be out of time, drawled, expressionless. Those who know how to sing must lead the others, and the unlearned must follow that lead. Just how to bring a consummation, so devoutly to be desired, is a problem to be worked out. However this may be brought about, the one thing to be ever emphasized must be that the devotional singing is not for the few expert singers, but for every one whose religious life goes out in praise and thanksgiving to God.

One great hindrance to the general participation in the service of song has been the desire of the singers for change and variety in music. A chorister will keep records of tunes used so as to repeat tunes as rarely as possible. Yet it is notorious that a tune to be well sung must be learned, and this learning is brought about, for the most part, by frequent repetition.

The good congregational singing of the German churches is to be attributed to the fact that but few tunes are used in worship, and the people grow familiar with them, so familiar that all can join in the service of praise, which is as it should be. And it is safe to say that if a church will, for a number of years, use its own hymns and tunes, the result will follow that more and more general will become the participation in this form of worship.

For no minister will use over 200 hymns, and a much smaller number suffices to satisfy the needs of most pastors, and the congregations soon learn to know the tunes and to sing them, unless the leader of the choir defeat the progress by a constant change of tune. Here the advantage of a hymnal is apparent, even if the selections are not always the best for any given individual.

In our own church variety is afforded by the themes clustering around the lessons and seasons of the Christian year. This will eliminate the possibility of any monotonous recurrence of given hymns. For even the repetition of a hymn in any given season, will only add to the charming heart life by its very expression of the embodied sentiment. Thus hymns and tunes appropriate and adapted to each other will be met in the recur-

ring seasons, which themselves are really the unfolding of the religious life of the Christian, and so help in the outburst of praise. All monotony is avoided, and in time full familiarity with both hymns and tunes, will develop what is so much desired—fuller congregational participation in singing.

And, now, since in this day of the Church's life, when it is hard to conceive a service without the element of praise in hymns to God, let us realize how wholly it is to the service of Him whose delight seems to be in the adoration of saints and angels, and be inspired to bring the Church to a more general whole-hearted participation in this form of worship.

In hymns the thankful heart has voiced its gratitude; the penitent soul has poured itself out in true contrition; the downcast have strengthened their confidence in God, as they sang His omnipotent love. In hymns the martyr honored the Christ he glorified in suffering; and the pilgrim, journeying through life, has made more real, for himself and others, the heavenly city, while he sang to Christ the glory of it; and the saint, passing out from sin and sorrow, has sweetened the bitterness of suffering by singing of the victory and the resurrection.

Hymns, as the outburst of our religious life, belong to every condition and experience of our Christianity, and he who, as poet or pastor, can, by any means, add to the more general participation in their use, in church and home, will do much for the greater enjoyment of the Christian life itself, as well as for the greater glory of God, whom we serve in worship.

“sons of the Highest,” (Psalm 82 : 6) as designating representative men, clothed, in a sense, with the dignity and authority of God as rulers of His people; and hence, the children of Israel, the favored people of God, were specially called collectively by God, His *son* (Exodus 4 : 22, 23; Hosea 11 : 1).

And not unfrequently, because of His relation to men in their creation and preservation, God is termed the Father of men. By creative energy and provident care, since the inception of life inheres in Him and its continuance depends on His watchful superintendence, we may in a true and profound sense be called sons of God, but not *sui generis*; not sharers in His essential, Divine nature. We hold our being from Him. In Him we live and move. He made us and not we ourselves. We are of God, but not God. Mere creaturehood under this, its highest and sublimest and divinest form, stands at an infinite remove from the Almighty Father of angels and men.

Nor must it be overlooked that the appellation, “sons of God,” is applied in a profoundly spiritual sense to believers. In regard to such St. John uses this very strong language, “To as many as received Him, gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” Again in his first epistle, “Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God.” And St. Peter even more boldly expresses this spiritual revelation when he speaks of believers being “partakers of the Divine nature,” *i. e.*, of the holiness which is God’s native property and His pre-eminent characteristic. It is in this way the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews explains it when he gives us to understand that the one purpose of God’s discipline is to make us evermore “partakers of His holiness.” And following the plain meaning of holy Scripture, the Church hesitates not to apply this appellation to all incorporated into the family of God by baptism. “They are sons of God, but sons by adoption in virtue of their fellowship with Him who is Son by nature.”

When now these terms are applied to Christ freely and frequently, "HIS SON" as in the familiar passage, "God sent forth His Son," as St. Paul speaks of Him; "HIS WELL BELOVED SON," according to the synoptic Gospels; "HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON" that mysterious word which St. John employs, asserting most explicitly His unique relation to the Father, and on two occasions appropriated by Christ Himself without the slightest reserve or moral shock, nor timidly put away, nor hesitatingly accepted: when others named Him to His face "THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD"—is it only in the same constructive and non-natural sense that such strangely significant terms are used? Is it an adequate explanation to regard them simply as titles of supreme affection, of endearment, or as some others claim, of pre-eminent excellence? Did they imply in His case no closer relation, nothing more intimate and vital? By no such surface-thought do we sound their depth of meaning. That far more than this was implied and actually accredited by the assertion of Divine Sonship is evident from the course of the high priest in the trial scene before Pilate. If the sonship was to have been taken only in a moral, or, highest of all, theocratic sense, what occasion for his rending his clothes, and in horror saying, "He hath spoken blasphemy" (St. Matthew 26: 63-65)? It was in the natural sense—the sense of His Eternal Being—in which the Lord's answer to the words of the high priest, "I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," was to be taken, only could be taken. It was a momentous hour. No marvel at the verdict. Ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, "He is guilty of death." Canon Liddon states that M. Salvador, an accomplished Jew of our own day, has shown that this question of our Lord's Divinity was here the real point at issue, maintaining that "a Jew had no logical alternative to belief in the Godhead of Jesus Christ except the imperative duty of putting Him to death." The members of the Sanhedrim make this very point, "*By our law* He ought to die, because He made Himself the

Son of God." In their own view, His sole criminality was in claiming to be a Divine Person.

No accommodative sense will explain this term of Divine Sonship so freely and frequently applied to Christ. The difference between Him and all mankind beside is strictly of essential nature and Divine constitution. No outward creative act puts Him and us on the same level. The title may not be thus indiscriminately applied to Him and to us. It is His exclusive property and right; and all that of Infinity lies in it and back of it, He shares with no one born alone of human parentage.

Doubtless, this is the pivotal point in all that claims to be distinctive Christianity. Everything in the person, and character, and saving merit of Christ; everything in the exclusiveness and permanence of Christianity, bearing along the hopes of sin-burdened humanity, turns, not on the matter of His pre-existence merely under any inferior and subordinate sense, but his absolute oneness of nature with God—distinct in person, one in eternal Being. Around the question, "What think ye of Christ?" gather all the interests of humanity touching the matter of a complete and adequate redemption. Was He beyond the bounds of time and creation in the profound depths of eternity, the SON OF GOD in a generic and exclusive sense? "Was He so God's Son as no other is or can be, and therefore, He alone has the name THE ONLY BEGOTTEN?"

As to one aspect of our Lord's nature there is no longer the slightest uncertainty. However, by the Ebionitic heresy, only a transient, apparitional, phantom form was attributed to Him, making the incarnation a mere theophany, an illusory and deceptive appearance, there is now no shadow of doubt as to His thorough identification with the race He came to save. To this end, the value is incalculable of these evidences of His real humanity—birth, hunger, thirst, weariness, sleep, pain; and death itself. His lower nature was our own nature, "flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone"—received as we take it, and "not joined to Him in the way of an outward accident or appendage merely," as there will be occasion to show a little further on.

The term Son of *man* definitely expresses His related state towards man.

But this person existed antecedently in a Divinely related state in the aspect of Deity, so "that of the great progenitor of Israel He could say with absolute truth," "Before Abraham was, *I am*." One term is profoundly significant of His eternally related state in the Godhead—Son of God, consequently the eternal Son, expressive of a like generic relation on the Divine side as true and perfect God in this instance as true and perfect man in the former.

Against the phrase ETERNAL SON the sweeping assertion is made, that it is all nonsense. As has already appeared, father and son indicate a related state in a community of essence or nature. This holds in the Godhead no less than the family of man. The Baptismal formula is most pronounced in its recognition here of a threefold distinction, equally and eternally related. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST." A fair and honest interpretation must stoutly maintain that these are *personal* and not mere official distinctions. Were this only authorized formula changed to *Creator, Redeemer* and *Sanctifier*, it could not be accepted anywhere as Christian Baptism in its primal sense and significance. Its administration simply in a threefold office standing in a single Divine person is not according to its original institution and intent. Where any sufficient authority for baptism at all if the Divinely related state of Christ in the Godhead be thus systematically and completely repudiated? Whence His authority to issue such a commission, if the Divine Sonship ascribed to Him, claimed for Him and by Him, be but the purest nonsense—shadow without substance. Only on the ground of what He was antecedently "in the bosom of the Father" could there be anything like universal character and force in this solemn commission, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations."

What elsewhere is said of the eternally related state of the Holy Ghost, the third in this conjunction of Divine person,

must help us to a right understanding of the true and proper Sonship of Christ. This express declaration is made respecting the eternity of the Spirit. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God." This Eternal Spirit is declared the Spirit of the Father. Thus, "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you; He that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies by His SPIRIT that dwelleth in you." This Eternal Spirit is also declared to be the Spirit of the Son. Thus, "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the SPIRIT OF HIS SON into your hearts, crying, Abba Father." Eternity, it appears, is a common quality, inhering alike in the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit. What is affirmed in this regard of one person is affirmed of each and all. "The Spirit is denominated Eternal; consequently the Father and the Son are Eternal. These terms indicate related states, which are thus Eternal.

On two separate occasions, both of the deepest significance, His baptism and transfiguration on the mount, marvellous attestation of His Divine Sonship was given, the voice of God making this explicit acknowledgement: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" and, as addressed to His inner consciousness, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." What was the precise import of this Divine message? Was it meant to assert simply *an official* character—the realization of the Messianic idea—or, as Olshausen and many commentators like him stoutly maintain, His "Divine eternal nature?" Both the unique message and the solemn transaction lose their deep significance if made to refer to anything but the personality back of that humble human form. Of our Lord's human nature as such, these astonishing words could not have been spoken, because it had no substance in and by itself. Only to and of the Divine person standing in union with the nature assumed were they and could they have been said. Dr. Kidd admirably says, in his treatise *On the*

Sonship of Christ, "This Divine person retained, and could not but retain, His related state of Son to the Father or first person, after he had assumed the human nature into personal union with His Divine. Consequently the Divine nature of Christ subsisted in the related state of the Son in the Godhead, before He assumed the human nature into union with Himself. God, in the person of the Father, was, therefore, eternally well pleased with God, in the person of the Son. If our Lord be called the Son of God, He can only be so in that nature which possesses Sonship in the proper sense of the term. It must, therefore, be, with respect to His Divine nature, that He was, and is, and ever will be, the Son of God. The voice from heaven, on each of those occasions, concerned the PERSON addressed, not the appearance with which he was invested."

Says Bishop Wordsworth, "The distinct appearance of the Holy Ghost at Christ's baptism, together with the voice from heaven, 'This is my beloved Son,' brings out clearly the distinctness of each of the three persons in the EVER BLESSED TRINITY; and was an appropriate prelude to the fuller revelation of the doctrine of the Ever blessed Trinity, in whose name the whole world is now to be baptized, according to the institution of Christ."

Two phrases in the Epistle to the Hebrews set forth, with greatest precision and force, the Essential Sonship of Christ; "THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS GLORY AND THE EXPRESS IMAGE OF HIS PERSON." Whether or not, St. Paul was the writer affects none whatever its canonical dignity and authority, nor its positive Christological character and evident sacrificial sense. Never doubted as to its origin, and, perhaps, now incapable of doubt, nothing could be more pronounced in its doctrine of the person and atoning work of Christ. From the first note the ring is as clear as a bell. Of all the writings of the Apostolic period it makes the profoundest arguments for His absolute Divinity, ascribing to Him in language most emphatic and direct, co-eternity with the Father, His associate and peer in almighty energy. Therefore is He greater than the angels—

they, creatures, He, Creator; they, simply "ministering spirits," He, Lord and Master, the proper object of their adoration and worship; greater than the prophets, even Moses, foremost of them all, they, *voices* simply of God's eternal truth, more or less distinct; He, Essential Truth, the Self-revelation of God; greater in priestly office and power than Melchisedec and Aaron; theirs, sacrifices ever repeated, and of a national and transient character simply; His, of force always for the sins of the world, Himself, in that mysterious word, **ONCE FOR ALL**, clothed with a universal and perpetual Priesthood.

The writer rests not his astounding claim in mere naked assertion. Step by step of the majestic argument, proof is furnished of the personal superiority of Christ in all these respects.

What Melchisedec, and Moses, and Aaron, and even the highest angel could never pretend to, is here attributed to Christ: "The Brightness of His glory, and the express Image of His person." The original is especially expressive and strong—*ὅς ὦν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ της ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*. "*His person*" is not the English equivalent of *ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*. The earliest English versions had "substance," in a word, the deepest Essence; and hence, Essential nature and properties—Oneness of Divine Being. This is distinctly intimated in the foregoing clauses. *Ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*, the splendor of His glory—gives us the idea of One eternally with God as having streamed forth, as a ray of light from the bosom of the sun wherein it was born, from the very "substance of the Father."

The nearest equivalent is the expression of the Nicene Creed "**LIGHT OF LIGHTS, VERY GOD OF VERY GOD.**" A striking parallel is found in the Book of Wisdom. As radiance issuing from a central orb, so Wisdom is characterized as "the effulgence of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror or the power of God, and the image of His goodness." Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Theodoret are one in their interpretation of the passage as affirming in the strongest way possible, the *co-eternity* of the Son with the Father. The last named asserts, that He is "the *everlasting* Son of the

Father, as the ray of light from the sun is coetaneous with the sun, from whence it flows by a natural process." *Maximus* declares, "He is called Son, because He is of one substance with the Father and more than that, because He is from Him." The second phrase—*καρὰ τῆς οὐσίας*,—the *Image of His Essence*—gives us the idea of an actual counterpart in the same sphere precisely whether of things or of being, as the seal and its impression, as the die and the coin, as the mould and the effigy, as the sire and the son. Distinct from each other, and yet they are literally equal the one to the other. "Christ is both personally distinct and yet literally equal to Him of whose Essence He is the adequate imprint."

Says Dr. Kidd, "None but a Divine person can be an express representative of another Divine person in the Divine nature. Now, if, in any moment, the Son was an express representative of the Father, the Son must have been so from all eternity and must be so in self-existence. For, as the Father is eternal in His nature, that which *expressly* represents Him must, in like manner, be eternal; otherwise it could not be an express representation. It could only be a contingent and dependent representation of Him; but this is no representation of Him in His nature. For the express representative of the nature must possess the express qualities of the nature of Him whom He represents. He who is this representative, must be an eternal representative . . . Now, this quality of express representation is declared to inhere in the Son. As the Son, in the related state of the Son, He is the express image or representation of the Father—this quality is eternal: the Son in whom this quality inheres, is, therefore, Eternal Son."

Historically the Epistle to the Hebrews forms a stepping stone to the Christology of St. John—Antedating by a quarter of a century at least the writings of the Apostle—internal evidence showing that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple—yet in two points there is a striking resemblance to the essential Godhead of Christ in the opening words of the Epistle as well as in the golden prologue

of the fourth Gospel, asserting in majestic strain and with tremendous boldness and power, the personal distinction and yet generic oneness of God and the Word. The account made in the Epistle of the everlasting and all prevailing Priesthood of Christ brings to mind at once the sacerdotal prayer of the ever-living High Priest (Hebrews, vii. 25), recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel. They are alike in the profound appreciation of the essential identity of the Word with God, on the one side, and with man on the other: He, who was "made flesh and dwelt among us"—man among men—being antecedently and eternally with God, and God.

There is nothing in human language so majestic and grand as the opening verses of the fourth Gospel—a wave from the great ocean of eternity to the shore of time. How well, from its profound insight into the heart and core of the Self-revelation of God has it been named the Gospel of the INCARNATION—the mysterious and necessary union of the Divine and human in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, constituting Him, and Him alone, the Saviour of the world and the fountain of life eternal.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The initial word of the New Testament is the same as that of the Old, with a marked difference. The Evangelist goes far beyond the historian of the creation, and plunges into the illimitable depths of eternity—into the profound secrets of the constitution of the Godhead. "The beginning" of the earlier writer marks the initial point of time and creation—God emerging into history and actual revelation. But back of all creative activity and epochs, St. John's "beginning" espies and asserts not merely the necessary pre-existence of the Creator, but still more profoundly a personal distinction holding in the essential nature of the Godhead. He thus defines the character and mode of being of the Word anterior to all time-relations, "The Word was;" ay more "The Word was *with* God;" and still more, not as a mere quality or attribute, as wisdom or power, but, "The Word was GOD." Reading aright this profound utterance, we get

satisfaction and comfort on three points: primal and personal distinction in the Godhead, named God and the Word: not mere co-existence, but concurrent thought and purpose: and, thirdly, such entire oneness of being, as completely to shut out any and all idea of inferiority of *nature*—simply yet plainly affirming the true and proper Divinity of the Word, “and the Word was God”—*θεός* not *ὁ θεός*. The use of the article would have given pure Sabellianism, confounding the Word and God, and so contradicting the preceding proposition: The Word's personal Being in Himself.

Clearly the eternal and essential Sonship of Christ was the thought in St. John's mind and faith. With this holy Scripture in manifold statements, and the entire work of redemption necessarily involving His advent in the flesh, stand in easy and natural reconciliation. And, so, what a flood of light His own full and unequivocal declaration pours from the Essential Fact! “God so loved the world that He gave HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” See, He speaks in a completely unique and peculiar sense of His relation to the Father. He claims to be not only His essential Son, but His only Son—the one and only Being in all the universe to whom the title in this proper sense belongs.

Then anterior to His earthly mission was He the Son of God. The filial relation began not first of all in His advent in the flesh. The Incarnation postulates a precedent Being. Otherwise it would have been altogether an absurdity for Him to have spoken of becoming the Son of God by being made the Son of man. Only because anteriorly the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON was He given and sent, could He have been given and sent.

In fact, but for such an antecedent relation of this essential character, how could our Lord have been in any position to have made the strong and strange avowal, “God so loved the world.” Had He not been all and just what He thus claimed to be, how could He have made such authoritative statement of God; and presented, besides, the stupendous measure He gives

of the greatness of God's love. All He said would have been the sheerest pretension, apart from the fact of His absolute, eternal Being. "He could," observed a Bampton lecturer, "have had no authority to utter what He did if He was not what He said He was. And if He was not what He said He was, is not that absolutely fatal to the truth of the statement which He affirmed?"

Hostile thought suggests two explanations. Some read the title in a purely theocratic, and others in a merely ethical or moral sense. It is argued that, in the one sense, the Messianic ideal, which confessedly formed the burden of Jewish thought, and life, and faith, and hope, and struggle, utterly failing of realization in any princely character through the whole line of Jewish kings, came ultimately to its actual fulfilment in Christ; and that, as the true representative of this High Davidic or theocratic idea, He claims to be in such unique and exclusive sense the One Son of the Highest. Sufficient answer has already been made to this suggestion, in that the hostility of the Jews to Christ, even to the tragic end, was inspired and intensified, not by any mere Messianic pretense, but the shocking claim of true and absolute Divinity on His part.

In the other case it is argued that by pre-eminent and unparalleled moral character, *par-excellence*, standing on sublimest heights, to which no one else had or could pretend, Christ had shown Himself, beyond all of mortal born, *the* Son of God. The utmost of our Lord's claim of Divine Sonship, according to this view, is consummate moral excellence. Many Unitarian writers, from Channing down—noble specimens of moral greatness—have expressed in the highest terms their appreciation of this transcendent Genius for goodness, giving Him in such wise a sort of apotheosis—the adoration and homage due a superior moral Hero.

But, as showing in His own deep and abiding God-consciousness the sense of an original and unshared relation to the Almighty Father, going immeasurably beyond either theocratic or ethical sense just referred to, only observe this fact, that Christ

never says, in a common plural, "Our Father." Always it is, "My Father," your Father, forever putting Himself in a class by Himself; guarding, one might say, with most jealous exclusiveness, His absolute pre-eminence, His sole privilege and dignity. Take a specimen or two of this exceptional style of speaking of Himself. If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of "My Father which is in heaven." "So likewise shall My heavenly Father do unto you, if you from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." "But to sit on my right, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of My Father." "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven." "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." "Touch me not; for I have not yet ascended to My Father," are the words of the risen Christ to the adoring Mary.

These are but a few of the passages in which the phrase occurs, with a single exception taken from the first Gospel. It would be an easy matter to multiply them. Only think of an ordinary mortal speaking to other mortals in this style—arro-gating to Himself the absolute and exclusive right to God as His Father. It would be a piece of presumption and effrontery which other men would resent with unsparing indignation and scorn. And, in fact, it ought not to be at all otherwise on the part of Christ, if there be no more ground than you and I have for such marked and entire, such uniform and unequivocal separation of Himself from the whole world of mankind. It is only the possession of a Divine nature, unshared by all other men that reconciles us to the claim on His lips, MY FATHER. Ever stronger and deeper grows the conviction that this and this alone gives unity, clearness, coherence, and consistence to the inspired volume.

When St. Peter made prompt answer to the Lord's own

direct question, "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" "Thou art Christ the SON OF THE LIVING GOD," can any man for a moment imagine that this was an exuberant utterance of the confident realization in Christ at last of the Davidic ideal only, filling the Jewish mind and literature, canonical and apocryphal, or an enthusiastic anticipation simply of that later thought which singles Him out as the flower and efflorescence of moral goodness and greatness—the one Perfect Man of the race? Read in the easy and natural way in which it was spoken, without the intrusion of a forced and foreign explanation, and not a thoughtful man but who will assert that the idea in the Apostle's mind, and taking actual shape in his hearty confession was the true and proper Divinity of Christ, the very germ, in fact, of which in the Nicene Creed was thus more fully explained: GOD OF GOD, LIGHT OF LIGHT, VERY GOD OF VERY GOD, BEGOTTEN, NOT MADE, BEING OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH THE FATHER.

At the close of his Gospel, St. John gives this as its one aim and purpose, "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the SON OF GOD; and that believing ye might have life through His name."

At the close of a powerful sermon, *Witnessing for Christ*, Canon Liddon relates the following: "Something more than fifty years ago there was a small dinner party in London. The ladies had withdrawn, and under the guidance of the company the conversation took a turn utterly dishonorable to Jesus Christ our Lord. One of the guests said nothing, but presently asked the host permission to ring the bell, and when the servant appeared he ordered his carriage. He then, with the courtesy of perfect self-command, expressed his regret at being obliged to retire, but explained that he was still a thorough believer in the Divinity of Christ. Perhaps it may occur to some that the guest who was capable of this act of simple courage must have been a bishop, or at least a clergyman. The party was made up entirely of laymen, and the guest in question became the great Prime Minister of the early years of the reign of Queen Victoria; he was the late Sir Robert Peel."

VIII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER FIFTH.—(*Concluded.*)

A SURE STONE.

"I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: And when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—St. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

SECTION VII.

Christ's Sympathy for Peter.

It is an honor, and a glory, and an easy thing, at the present day, to be a member of the Christian church. But it should be borne in mind that every stone of this great highway on which it was promised His ransomed should go, singing, home to God, was built by the martyrs in sweat and tears and groans and blood. Only thus can true sympathy be had for the Saviour as well as His chief fellow-sufferer; for, in him, Jesus was likewise persecuted.

Was it nothing to the Master that His noblest pupil was buffeted by servants at the moment He was powerless to interpose in his defence? For, after that last command in the garden, "Let these go their way," Jesus, "as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before her shearers is dumb, opened not his mouth." His people were the body of which ("the church") He was the head, and He durst no more complain for them than for Himself. Was it no trial to the royal-hearted Son of David that the humble fisherman became entangled in this shameful net solely through love of

Him ? If Peter had not returned and followed, or following, had stood without, none would have questioned him. Was it a small matter for the King of Israel to know that the bitterest foeman of His house would take advantage of His position as its hostage, and almost in His presence deliberately kneel and clasp and lock hard the cruel snare in which by His permission he had entrapped the feet of His eldest son ? Was it no grief to Him, just as He was laying down His life for the truth, to be confronted by the father of lies with a three-fold denial in the mouth of His chief disciple ?

Most fatal was the recoil of that day's work on Satan's head, for the blow that Jesus dealt him in the hour of Peter's need, was heavier than the one He gave him in His own behalf. Jesus loves the sheep of His flock more than their shepherd. How much more, then, did He love this one, the first whom He had found in the wilderness and lifted to His heart, carried in His arms, borne on His shoulders, and was yet to raise to His head as a crown of rejoicing ! Malignity overstepped itself that day, for the depth and shame of Peter's fall only lent energy and strength to his deliverer. In him, Christ had (through His omniscience) a living, suffering, animating witness to the absolute necessity of His self-sacrifice by holding fast to that veriest truth—His eternal divinity—which Peter was denying, and which alone could save Peter and secure the Messiah's condemnation to death.

Did it add no sorrow to the suffering Son of God to carry this child on His heart in the last great agony—to feel that He could not be wholly born into the Christian church till He should have died and risen again—to know that He must indeed give His life for him, and yet not once be able with His dying eyes to implore him to fight the tempter, and hold fast to his faith ? For Peter was not in the room with Jesus when he denied Him. St. John alone was allowed to follow Him there. "That disciple was known to the high priest ;" and, presumably, had been chosen by Christ to witness and report the scenes of His trial, which at this time was private. "Peter sat

without in the palace," "in the court" with the servants and officers, "warming himself" at the fire which had been made in that open hall, "for it was cold." In vain the hardy fisherman "stood and warmed himself." No material heat could aid him now. "The Sun of righteousness" was sinking fast below the clouds of his horizon, and the chill of death was creeping over his soul. Not till Jesus should cross this broad hall would a golden gleam be thrown upon him, and then—then it would be—too late to prevent the denial.

"Lord, if Thou hadst been here!"

But much as he tried to avoid his questioners by going from hall to porch, and porch to hall, Peter was to deny the Lord, even as Paul was to persecute the infant-church. Thus, each of these apostles was to be prepared for his work in the world. In this way, by leaving willful men to themselves, "the LORD creates evil," * in order that out of it good may come.

In His firm hold of this disciple—who confessed Him when others were silent, who clave to Him when many turned and ceased to follow, and whom He therefore would not leave to Satan and his own sinful nature—the Messiah must have borne Simon on His heart into the underworld. How else could Peter know so well whither Jesus had gone, and the work He was doing, when absent those three days from the body, as to be able to tell that "being put to death in the flesh," He was "quickened in the spirit; in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah?" †

And when Jesus returned again to the upper world and the joyous light of the sun, this disciple was still on His heart; for He hastened till they met each other, the loving and the loved, the saved and the Saviour. If this be not so, why should Christ have been seen *first* "of Cephas," and *then* "of the twelve." O rare constancy! O faithful promiser! Though

* Isaiah xlv. 7. Amos iii. 6.

† R. V. I. Peter, iii. 19, 20.



Peter had forsaken and denied the Lord, to Him he is still "the first." When bringing in the covenant of promises and not of conditions, that of "Abraham" as the Virgin mother sang, the covenant with forgiven Eve whose sinless seed He was—the new, the second Adam appears *first*, of all the apostles, to Simon, and *after* him to the others. On that great day when the triumphant shout of the resurrection rang through the infant-church, and the joyful greeting passed from mouth to mouth—"The Lord is risen!" the like joyful refrain was—"And hath appeared unto Simon!" He, who could be seen of no one unless He chose, appeared first,* privately, to Simon, and then was seen publicly "of the twelve!" And for what purpose did He appear thus in private to Peter, but that no eye might witness his repentance and confession, nor see the broken rock restored to perfect shape and soundness. And after this, what second great object had Jesus in view, when, "at the Sea of Tiberias," He "manifested Himself again to the disciples!"

SECTION VIII.

Peter's Love for Jesus.

Judas neither believed in nor loved the Master, but Peter did both even when he denied Him. His faith had not failed. Jesus had prayed for it. It was as strong in Him as the Messiah and incarnate Son when he denied, as when he confessed Him; but it had been overlaid by fear. Faith alone is not enough to make the steadfast Christian. "The devils also believe, and tremble." And though a man "have all faith so

* St. Peter—supposed to have dictated Mark's gospel—says "He appeared first to Mary Magdalene" (often confounded with Mary of Bethany) "out of whom He had cast seven devils." In an Easter sermon, bishop Andrews of the seventeenth century says that by this commission—"Go to my brethren, and say unto them, "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God"†—Christ made the Magdalene "an apostle to the apostles."

Of course the Mother of Jesus is not, in this instance, counted with the disciples, men and women. Of her it had been prophesied, "A sword shall pierce thine own soul also," and she would be sought *first* by her risen Son.

that he could remove mountains, and have not love, he is nothing." Neither is knowledge enough. The evil spirits knew that Jesus was the Messiah, and cried out, "saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And He rebuking suffered them not to speak." Nor, on Peter's part, was love wanting, that love which was to exceed all men's, and on which he so confidently relied, that he needed not to "watch and pray." And this love was not lacking in quality. It was always, and equally, unselfish and ardent. It was only deficient in quantity. It could not reach to the extent of dying with his Master on the cursed tree. And the measure of it fell short, because though he believed in and loved Him as true man and true God, he did not love Jesus as the Saviour of sinners. But this was for the reason that he had not yet learned Him as such.

There is no doubt Simon had been all his life a slavish adherent to the ceremonial law. In proof thereof, observe Satan's endeavor, later, to entrap him by this very means.* And prior to this, in the vision of things "common or unclean," hear Simon's answer, "Not so, Lord," to Christ's command, "Arise, Peter; slay and eat." That he denied Jesus "with an oath" and "cursing and swearing," is no proof that he was not also a strict observer of the moral law. Much less is it an evidence that he was "habitually profane!" In that case, he would hardly have been, not only a partner with James and John in their trade of fishermen, but also their most intimate companion and friend. To Peter and John, especially, the beautiful language of the Psalmist could be truthfully applied—"We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company." That "profanity," on the contrary, showed how severely the devil tried Simon with the apparition of the cross, and proved to him (what Jesus meant it should) that he too must not depend, like the Jews, on the works of the law, nor on the fact that they were "Abraham's seed," and could say, "Abraham is our father." Though regenerated, he was not yet wholly "converted," as Jesus inti-

* Acts, xv. Gal. ii. 11-17.

mated when He warned him that Satan had desired to have him. And that lack of thorough conversion was caused by the need of a strong conviction of sin.

St. Paul said he "had not known sin, but by the law." St. Peter could have said he had not known the gospel, but for sin. Paul's experience of the law was to qualify him for preaching Christ's cross and sin original. Peter's, of the gospel, was to enable him to proclaim actual transgression and Christ's salvation. The mission of each, as of all the apostles, was first to "the House of Israel," to all "the elect" who were the heirs of the promise; and then to the world, to Jew and Gentile, bond and free, "every creature under heaven." The sufferings of Paul were severe and unremitting. The trial of Peter to fit him for work was short, sharp and decisive. Jesus, as man, had but to hide His face from him a little while, and as God to withdraw His restraining grace for a moment to convince him of his true nature by birth—not of righteous Abraham, but of disobedient Adam—and then Peter, forgiven "until seventy times seven," was ready to accept and preach the Lord, not merely to the Jews as their veritable Messiah and Jehovah, but to the whole world as its one, only, and all-sufficient Saviour.

Simon knew of the Baptist's loud testimony that Jesus was "the Lamb of God," and it may seem strange that he did not learn earlier that He was to be an atoning sacrifice. No doubt he had heard this, too, but hearing a truth and experiencing it are very different. The apostles had been told, distinctly, they would forsake the Lord. And Peter had been informed with a "Verily, verily," that he would deny Him. But none believed it. Even the messages brought by the women from the angels, and from Christ after His resurrection "seemed to them as idle tales." They were dazzled by the splendor of, and eager for, that earthly kingdom which they imagined Jesus was about to restore to Israel. Humble as they were, never were men more aspiring than those twelve chosen Galileans. They not only "disputed among themselves who

should be the greatest" in the new reign, but the brothers, James and John, endeavored by stratagem to secure the highest places therein; whilst "the ten were moved with indignation against them" for fear they might succeed. Notwithstanding the repeated teachings and warnings of their Master that His kingdom should not be an earthly, but a spiritual one, and attained only through suffering, the disciples failed to comprehend its nature. Those "twelve thrones" on which He had promised they should sit in the restoration, "judging the twelve tribes of Israel," were stumbling-blocks in their way; whilst "the keys" Peter was to hold, Satan used to charm him, the most princely of all in spirit, with visions of royalty, and a crown, and splendor surpassing Solomon's.

Even Judas, too, no doubt, mused like the others, and in his own imagination was to be lord of the exchequer when this unrivalled kingdom should be brought in. So far, the lack and love of money had made him mean and avaricious, but the care of an abundance of it in the future (he may have dreamed) would change him—a thief and a miser—into an honest and beneficent man! Like all his countrymen, he was disappointed by the unworldliness of the Christ. But, unlike his bribers, he had some grace, for he hastened to them and deplored his sin and threw their money at their feet.

Simon's views were erroneous, for he had not yet been guided by the Spirit "into all truth." And for the same reason his love was deficient. But Jesus accepted it, and kept him by means of it till he should know and understand the truth, and be able to keep himself. Hence, loving and trusting the Master, Peter, after having forsaken Him, shunned Him not, as did Judas the betrayer. On the contrary, he quickly returned and followed Christ into the judgment-hall. And, even though there, pursued by Satan, he denied Him, yet, when he heard that His grave was empty, he ran with John to the deserted tomb. Verily, "he that believeth shall not make haste!" Except, indeed, it be the haste that drives the offender to the feet of Him against whom he has sinned

and whose cause he has disgraced—there to confess his fault, implore forgiveness, and bow to the manner and measure of his punishment.

*SECTION IX.**Jesus Forgives and Restores Peter.*

Over that first and most private interview between St. Peter and the Messiah, after His resurrection, a veil is thrown. No account of it is given by any of the evangelists. St. Luke merely states that when the disciples who were going to Emmaus turned back to tell those in Jerusalem that Jesus was risen, and had met them on their way, they were anticipated with the words, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." And St. Paul in summing up in one of his Epistles the witnesses of Christ's resurrection, also barely says that "He was seen of Cephas, and then of the twelve."

But the object of that meeting at the sea of Tiberias, which Jesus had in view when He bade the women direct His disciples to go into Galilee where they should find Him, is worthy of careful study. St. John mentions this assembling, but he alone records (in the beginning of his gospel) that when Jesus first beheld Simon, He said that he should be the greatest of the Christians. Then St. John is the very one who ought to narrate and record the fulfilment of that early promise; and at the end of his gospel is the natural place to look for it. It is evident he thought his book would be incomplete without it, and that he, as the bosom-friend of St. Peter, ought to note the supreme event of this gathering, for he gives it in minute detail. Seven apostles obeyed the call of the Lord, and seven being the number of perfection, they represented the whole Church; and what Jesus desired *it* to hear, every member of it ought to know.

It was not enough for the Head of the Christian Church to accept Peter's repentance, and pardon Him in private. Peter had confessed and denied Jesus openly, and openly he was to be reproved, restored and confirmed; for him whom the Lord

loveth, He loveth and keepeth to the end, and He had first chosen Simon, and not Simon Him. The special object which the Master had in view when calling this meeting, was more than merely to restore the chief rock of His church, which Satan had dislodged, defaced and broken. It was also to give to Peter "the keys" that had been promised him at his confession, but were forfeited by his fall. In His own death the prophecy uttered many years before had been fulfilled. The great, living Stone, to which the Lord had called the attention of His people by the word, "Behold," had been "laid in Zion," and now the first of the twelve, which were to follow, was to be set in the presence of the brethren, and then the Son of God having finished the work He had been sent to do might return to the bosom of the Father.

"So when they had dined," (or broken their fast) on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias or Galilee, "Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these (love me)?"

"Simon, son of Jonas!" Had Peter known the force of those words, how his heart would have sunk. He was no longer "Cephas" the son of the Christ, nor "Peter" the son of the incarnate Lord. Having forfeited the new life, he was dispossessed of the new name. By his emphatic denial of Him, he had ranged himself with the Jews who rejected Christ, and could now claim no sonship but that of the man by nature sinful. However, there was hope for him in the fact that though guile had been found in his mouth, it was not premeditated guile. He had erred more through excessive fear, than want of faith and love. But Simon had yet to learn that "the fearful" as well as the unbelieving and unloving shall be cast out.

"Simon, son of Jonas, Lovest thou me more than these?" What a charge! He says not a word of the denial, but goes straight to its cause—insufficient love. And yet Peter answers, "Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee *dearly*,"

which is the strength of the word "love" as he used it.* He was honest. He did love the Lord, and ardently. Like Job of old who held fast to his integrity, he could hold fast to his love. And Jesus knew it. "He saith unto him, Feed my lambs." Ah, Peter's trial would make him tender to the young and the weak, the ignorant and the fearful. He was now on the way to strengthen his brethren. And with this precious command the first denial was wiped out, and the first restoration was made in the eyes of them all. He was again "Cephas," and on the list of the disciples his name still stood at the head.

"He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" "Yea, Lord," Peter again replied, "Thou knowest that I love thee *dearly*." He might have appeared to boast in admitting that he loved Him "more than these." He might have done wrong in saying, "Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended;" but his love he could not deny. He had given proof of it. Because he loved the Master not enough, he denied Him. But because he loved Him much, he repented deeply. And again Jesus responded, "Feed my sheep," or, "Tend and watch over my sheep." With this second command, the second denial was erased, and Peter was restored to his place as the chief of the apostles.

"He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me *dearly*?" or, "Dost thou indeed love me so dearly?" adopting Simon's warmer and more affectionate word.†

A third accusation, seemingly, and all for want of love! Yes, for says St. Paul, "though I have the gift of prophecy,

* "It is to be noticed that in the Greek, in which St. John wrote, a different word is used for "love" in our Lord's question and in St. Peter's answer. That in the question—"Lovest thou Me?" is the word that would be naturally used for the love of man to God: that in the answer—"I love Thee"—is a word signifying a more warm and personal love, such as that of the nearest relatives. (Com. on N. T., St John 21:15).

† Com. on N. T., (St. John 21:17).

and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and give my body to be burned, and have not love, I am nothing." Simon! Simon! had you but held more firmly to your love, come life or death of any kind, when Satan pressed you hard, you would not now be sick at heart and sore in conscience.

"Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me dearly?" He naturally thought the Lord was recalling, and the brethren remembering, that he had protested, "Though *all* shall be offended, yet will not *I*," and that notwithstanding this emphatic protest, he alone, at three separate times had affirmed—"I know not the man." But Peter was again at fault, because blinded by the pricking of his conscience. Could he have looked a little deeper into the Master's heart, he would have found His object quite another than to reproach and wound His dear disciple. He would have discovered that there was something more to be evoked from himself than loving protestations, no matter how sincere and deep. For, mark the words which this "third time" of Jesus, and this grief of Peter, has drawn from Simon—who, though he must never forget that he is the son of Jonas, is ever to remember that he is also the son of Christ—"And he said unto him, Lord, *Thou knowest all things*; Thou knowest that I love Thee *dearly*!"

Up to this point, Simon has not once said, "Thou knowest *whether* I love thee," but, "*that* I love thee." He has no doubt of his love for Jesus. Neither has Christ any doubt of it. But it begins to dawn on Peter's simplicity that there must be none on the part of the brethren. He is right. They too must be assured of its sterling worth, for he is to be their leader; though of this he would be the last to think. He only recognizes the fact that he must be restored to their fellowship also. The Master alone can, and must, confirm his words, or all hope is gone for him. And now, at the last extremity, he casts his own twice repeated "Yea" to the winds,

and trusting solely to Jesus to attest the truth of what he says, Peter cries from the very depth of his soul—"Lord, *thou* knowest all things, *thou* knowest that I love thee *dearly*."

Marvellous is that act, though he observes it not, nor sees that Jesus was waiting for it. In the same breath, and with those same words, that he appealed to Christ—" *Thou knowest all things* "—he has made a spontaneous, free, full and unmistakable re-acknowledgment, in the presence and hearing of the brethren, of their Master's omniscience and eternity! To the delight of Jesus, and the confounding of Satan, he has virtually repeated the very same confession—"Thou art the Son of the living God"—for which he had been chosen and regarded as "more than these;" and, in spite of the Accuser, continues to be retained and valued as such. For the public reassertion of that truth which had made him the first and chief disciple, and which truth he had never doubted, Peter is now actually, and all unwittingly, being reinstated as the prince of the apostles, and installed as the shepherd and bishop of souls!

When Jesus "said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me dearly," Peter no doubt was grieved the more, since, in declaring, "though all shall be offended because of thee, yet will not I," he had seemed to intimate that the love of the brethren was less than his own. But still at fault, Peter did not see that the Lord's marked contrast of "*thou*," and "*these*," had been meant for a widely different purpose. It was intended to place them in the background and bring him to the front. Ignorant of his own worth, he was blind to the fact that by this grievous "third time" the Master meant equally to elicit from him, and impress upon them, his reconfession of that truth, which, though Simon had in effect denied it, still distinguished him from them and all others. Jesus wounds only to heal and to restore. He would not allow him, who loved and believed, to "make haste," nor to be "confounded," nor to be "put to shame."

And now He quickly "saith unto him, Feed my sheep," or

rather, according to the sense of the Greek word, "my *dear* sheep;" that is, "the souls dearest to Christ, those most truly His own."* For Simon was frank and truthful and modest. He must have told the brethren that he had denied the Lord (since all were scattered where none could hear) but he never so much as claimed that he had been the first to confess Him, nor boasted that to him had been promised, and were to be given, "the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," And with that wonderful third charge, the third denial was blotted out, full restoration made, and the first rock of the church publicly established. Living, peculiar, precious and tried, it settled of its own weight into place, and was sealed, by the Builder of the temple made without hands, a stone forever sure.

SECTION X.

Simon is Further Honored.

In coupling as well as contrasting Peter and the brethren, by the words "thou," and "these," the Lord was judging and restoring all his apostles: for all had fallen when they were offended and fled and forsook Him; and each was to be reclaimed and installed a shepherd and bishop of souls. Those seven represented His church, which in many ways, great and small, continually denies Him and needs a Saviour. But now Jesus addresses Peter alone, for he alone had suffered and been stained by that offence of the cross—"accursed of God."

Simon's last answer, "Thou knowest all things," had so especially pleased the Master, that He immediately elevated him beyond his first dignity. But why does He proceed to add—while the others are closely attentive—in the same breath and with the solemnity of an oath: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest, but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not?" Does He

* Compare N. T. St. John xii. 37.

mean to say that Simon will again be tried, and again flee from the cross? * Is He indeed predicting that, when old and gray-headed, he will a second time shrink from crucifixion, and have to be dragged an unwilling and pitiable martyr to the stake, and so, dishonor the Lord."

Let St. John, Peter's twin-brother in Christ, answer for them both: "This spake He, signifying by what death he should glorify God."

"He should *glorify* God!" Then St. Peter did *not* dishonor the Lord; and that "whither thou wouldest not," referred solely to the past. Jesus was really saying that, for His sake, Peter would gladly and nobly endure crucifixion, in spite of his lingering Jewish prejudice, and almost unconquerable aversion to the cross and "the tree." Having proved the truth of His words, "Thou canst not follow me *now*," He was both renewing and confirming the promise to him, "But thou shalt follow me *hereafter*," and also giving to the rapt and listening Church assurance of a steadfast saint!

Determined that not a shadow of the past, nor a cloud of the future, should dim the lustre of His infant church, the Christ sent its first representative—the man He loved and had died for, and who loved and would surely die for Him—to walk henceforth among his brethren with the authority of a leader in his hand, and the promise of a martyr on his brow. The leader's authority was to keep always in Peter's mind, and in theirs, his great confession. And the public award of a martyr's crown, with its warrant of willing crucifixion,† was to prevent him from lording over them, and them from reproaching him. Most wise judge! most gracious king! Judgment had begun at "the House of God." And now, behold how Jesus forgives and restores. Yea, rather, see how to overflowing He fulfills His promises!

* According to tradition, St. Peter tried to escape martyrdom by crucifixion.

† Tradition says that St. Peter, considering himself unworthy to die like the Master, was, at his own request, crucified head downwards. This may be true, for it accords with his impetuous spirit: "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

But this was not enough for Him who exacts, and will repay, to the "uttermost farthing." The place dishonored by Simon's denial, He soon afterwards allowed him to honor by such a bold confession of Christ before the Sanhedrin, made in his own name and John's, as completely wiped out their reproach of forsaking Him. And prior to this, at Pentecost, He permitted all the apostles who "forsook Him and fled" to stand up with Peter, while he, in the name of them all, proclaimed Jesus to be their Messiah and Saviour.

SECTION XI.

Peter's Lessons.

Had the chief catechumen, Andrew's "own brother," learned the lessons the great Teacher set him? He knew before Christ's death, the first article of the Christian faith—that Jesus is highest man and God. Had he learned since, the second—that men are sinners and Jesus a Saviour?

Hear him, only a short time after the Lord's ascension, exhort his countrymen, "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins." "Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." And further add, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved."

What had Simon's trial wrought in his own case? Was he at last convinced of sin? Ah, on that memorable day of Pentecost, the Spirit of Christ wrought as much on Peter as on those three thousand who were convicted and converted by his preaching. Mark the energy with which, later, he reproves Ananias, in whose person his own sin of denying suddenly stares him in the face, and which he, as the head of the new church, is called to rebuke. See him uncover with a word the prompter of this sin: "Ananias, why hath *Satan* filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back

part of the price of the land?" Listen as he labors to make him see its enormity, for his was not, like Peter's, a sudden and unpremeditated lie, he had not been dragooned into sinning by Satan as the great apostle had: "Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." The Church had not laid it as a law on its members that they should have all things in common. The offering of their possessions was voluntary, and Ananias and Sapphira were not compelled to sell their land, and to lay the money at the apostles' feet. They were hypocrites, who had deliberately planned and executed this crime in hope of standing well with both God and the world. But the Lord would not tolerate a lie, acted, or unspoken, in His Church, for He had bought it with the absolute Truth.

Simon was at last convinced of the reality of a personal devil, of the existence of "Satan," who goeth "to and fro in the earth," constantly tempting men to sin, and against whom his Master had so earnestly warned him. At last he recognized and feared and preached this "devil," this "principle of evil," having personality and a name, this seeker of souls and bodies, to be delivered from whom their Lord bade them pray continually, of whose power he had been so incredulous, and to whose design upon himself he had been so fatally indifferent. Note how he warns his flock: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." Simon had heard that fatal roar, and felt the lion's deadly spring, when Judah's greater Lion quickly plucked him from his mouth.

Was Peter now persuaded that their Master's death was voluntary, necessary, and foreordained of God?

Hear him tell Christ's "betrayers and murderers:" "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified

and slain." "And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers. But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." Is this the man who said, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee!" Simon had heard those prophets often, but the Holy Ghost was not then witnessing to his spirit of the manner of Christ's sufferings and the purpose of His death. He had not then been born of the slain and crucified and risen and ascended Jesus, of whom he now says, "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins."

And, lastly, was he reconciled to the mode of the Messiah's death?

Alas, Peter oftener sees "the tree," than the cross; "hanging," than crucifying. Hark how he reproaches the Jews as he recalls the ignoble death of his "precious" Lord—"The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, *whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.*" And hear him also tell the Gentiles, of "Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; and whom the Jews slew and hanged on a tree."

Christ, being guiltless of transgression, was not *first* slain, and *then* hung; but Peter, in deepest grief, can not see it otherwise. Hanging, in its most ignominious sense, *after* death, and in addition to the legitimate punishment of a transgressor, as the sign of an outcast, accursed of God and man, is the burden of his lament. Slaying, he could forgive. That, they did ignorantly. But that in the slaying they should maliciously contrive to hang Him, he can not forget. Truly, Peter did love the Lord, for his own sure prospect of dying on the dreadful tree, he, the remainder of his life, cheerfully endured for the sake of Jesus who was to him "the chiefest among ten thousand," and the one "altogether lovely."


St. Peter could only glory in the person of Christ. He could never, as did St. Paul, "glory in His cross," for he had never, like him, touched one of the lowest depths of sin. It was not his to do on the saints the very work of Satan—"strive to compel them to blaspheme," or, "curse the name of Christ." Nor had he studied the Jewish law at the feet of Gamaliel, and been conversant with the philosophies of the Greek and Roman-schools. He was as unlearned in the mysteries of the natural man as the spiritual, and equally hard to convince of sin original and actual. Having been born an heir of the promise, and reared in obscurity, he had "escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust," and the commission of gross sins; and being of those happy ones in whose hearts the presence and companionship of the Holy One of God provokes no hostility, he found Him to be indeed a savor of life unto life, and not of death unto death. Hence, like St. John, who in all his Epistles and the Revelation never mentions the cross of Christ, he inclines, in his writings, to the Jewish figures of sacrifice, and speaks of redemption procured "with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot;" or, if he does see the cross, it is still in the Jewish conception of it—as "the tree"—"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree."

Peter, however, was to learn to love the cross, for had not the offence of it proved to be the stumbling-block which occasioned his fall, the mountain that hid the Lord from his sight and prevented his following Him? Therefore Jesus, when reinstating him and assuring the brethren that Simon should, and would, willingly suffer this death for His sake, at the same time gave him the remedy for his natural prejudice against it, in the words—"Follow thou me." Peter was to look only at Jesus, sacrificed for others, and thus joyfully accept Christ's manner of going as the most desirable martyr's death He could die. By this blessed contemplation of the Messiah as a Saviour, the wood, the nails, and the hanging were to fade

from his sight, or be esteemed as the welcome accessories by which he, who was so desirous to follow, should go to be "ever with the Lord." This "joy" the Master "set before" him, to enable him to "endure the cross and despise the shame"—the joy of being counted worthy to die the same kind of death as Himself. And, most certainly, his martyrdom was for the same cause—the teaching and preaching of His eternal divinity. That this discipline was effectual, can be seen in the alacrity with which, when the time arrived, he announced to his people, "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me." Childlike, impulsive and enthusiastic, in age as in youth, (the very qualities the Master chose and loved him for), it is easy to believe that Peter, who in the same breath protested, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," and begged, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head," did, likewise, when he had learned the secret of their Master's death on the tree, most gladly follow Him even there. By this time he was able to go, literally, "without the gate and the camp" and bear the "reproach of Jesus," for the Lord had removed its offence as "accursed of God."

Perhaps no small element of his willingness was the thought that he might thereby make some atonement for his sin. At least, the legend that St. Peter fled from crucifixion is provable to be wholly unworthy of him and of the Master. Forever engraved on his soul was that look of unfathomable pity, forgiveness and love, which, in his direful need, the Messiah and LORD on His way to the cross had turned upon him.

Of the Benjamite, Saul of Tarsus, the ravening wolf who hunted the flock of Christ even "unto strange cities," and who said, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things *contrary* to the Name of Jesus of Nazareth," the commission ran—"For I will show him how great things he must *suffer* for my name's sake." Whereas, on Simon Bar-Jona—who by the malice and intrigue of Satan was made to stumble and fall on his cross—Christ laid no heavier burden



than the happy duty of raising it, and bearing it aloft in the front of His armies, and proclaiming that Jesus of Nazareth who had been hung thereon was the Saviour of men—*Jesus hominum Salvator*. But of these two great apostles, neither would have been so active and untiring, nor so fitted to “strengthen the brethren,” had not each in the course of his history, been, like Job of old and like Christ in the wilderness, sorely tempted of the devil, and severely tried by the Spirit of God.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

PRESBYTERIANS. A POPULAR NARRATIVE OF THEIR ORIGIN, PROGRESS, DOCTRINES, AND ACHIEVEMENTS. By Rev. Geo. P. Hays, D.D., LL.D., with an Introduction by Rev. John Hall, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. William E. Moore, D.D., LL.D. New York: J. A. Hill & Co., Publishers. 1892. Sold only by subscription. Price, in cloth, \$2.75.

A stately and tasteful volume of 536 pages, a credit to the author and an honor to the denominations and peoples of whom he writes. It is a tribute, even though unconscious and unintentional, to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, that every Protestant denomination seeks, in some way, to trace its origin back to the very earliest ages of Christianity. Presbyterians go back even to the days of Moses to find the origin of the office of Elder (Presbyter), and they find Presbyterians in St. Patrick, and in the early times of the Irish and Scotch Churches, as well as in the Waldenses and Huguenots of later times. But it was not really till the times of John Knox in Scotland, and especially the Westminster Assembly in England (about A. D. 1640), that the Presbyterian Church proper had its origin. In a broader sense, however, "The Presbyterians" include all the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian Polity, and in this sense the author includes all the Reformed Churches that now belong to the "Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system," i.e., that hold to the parity of the ministry of Presbyters and a representative government of the same.

Our own Reformed Church, some eighty years older in its origin than the Presbyterian Church proper, and the Dutch Reformed, belong to this family.

The work is well written. The introductory chapters by Drs. Hall and Moore are valuable additions to the book. But the wilderness one gets into when trying to trace the origin of all the divisions of the great Presbyterian Church! Those endless divisions are a blot on Presbyterianism. If the Presbyterian doctrine and polity are all that is claimed for them in the authority of the Scriptures, surely they ought to be able to hold all these bodies in some sort of unity. It is the weakness of the Presbyterian Church that it presents all these divisions. Let the movement towards church union of some sort soon put an end to them. Let there be one family and one church, from these endless and foolish divisions. We say foolish, because many of them date their origin to Scotland

and a past age, and the causes which divided them have no longer any force or reason whatever. They are mere dead fossils.

The work is very interesting, and we only wish a manual of our own Church (and we have one or more that is very respectable), might appear in a dress as inviting and enticing, as to its exterior, as this volume is. To this end we need to cultivate a wider circle of readers and better pecuniary support for what we have. When will our Reformed Church feel a just pride in our ancient and worthy origin and in our honorable history!

GENESIS, PRINTED IN COLORS, Showing the Original Sources from which it is supposed to have been Compiled, with an Introduction, by Edwin Cone Bissell, Professor in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. Hartford, Conn., Belknap & Warfield, 1892. Price, \$1.25.

This is a highly interesting and instructive volume. In it we have the text of the Book of Genesis presented in a variety of colors—seven in all—a different color being used for the matter from each of the Original Sources of which, according to modern criticism, the book is a compilation. The purpose of its publication in this manner is to show at a glance the result of the analysis arrived at by the critics, and thus to enable students more readily to study it and form a correct idea concerning it. In the Introduction, which occupies twelve of the seventy-three pages of the work, Prof. Bissell states that the scheme of textual analysis presented in the book is that of Kautzsh and Socin, which he holds represents as well as any, perhaps, the general conclusions to which those favoring the analysis have come as it respects the Book of Genesis. He then explains the use made of the different colors in the text in setting forth this scheme, and notes some of the chief grounds on which it is advocated, together with such other facts as may guide the intelligent reader in his independent investigations, and point the way to just results.

The work is in every way admirably suited to the purpose for which it is intended, and will amply repay careful examination and study. It will, indeed, be found a valuable addition to any library, and all persons especially interested in the critical study of the Bible owe a debt of gratitude to Prof. Bissell for its preparation, and to the publishers for the excellent and attractive form in which they have given it to the public.

DARWIN AND AFTER DARWIN. An Exposition of the Darwinian Theory, and a Discussion of Post-Darwinian Questions. By George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. I. The Darwinian Theory. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1892. Price, \$2.00.

This volume is devoted, as its sub-title signifies, to the Darwinian Theory, and presents a systematic exposition thereof. In a clear and masterly manner the views of the great leader of modern

science on Evolution and Selection are explained, and the facts on which they are based, set forth, and in many cases strikingly illustrated by finely executed wood cuts. Throughout the work, moreover, care has been taken to avoid assuming even the most elementary knowledge of natural science on the part of those to whom the exposition is addressed, so that it can be read understandingly by any person of ordinary intelligence. For the correctness of its statements and explanations the name of its distinguished author is in itself a sufficient guarantee. To all who would acquire a true and exact knowledge of the teachings of Darwin, this work can therefore be heartily commended. It is, indeed, a book that ought to find a place in the library of every person who would be well informed as regards modern scientific research and thought.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. By Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. In two volumes. Vol. II. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

We have in this volume the completion of Prof. Dods' Exposition of the Gospel of St. John, prepared as part of the series known as "The Expositor's Bible." In the first volume the first eleven chapters of the Gospel were considered, and in this second volume the last ten chapters claim attention. Both volumes are possessed of the same admirable qualities of matter and style. Neither can be read without profit, and together they form the best popular exposition of the Fourth Gospel of which we have any knowledge. Those whose duty it is to preach or teach the Gospel will find the work very suggestive and stimulating. Throughout it abounds in profound and impressive thought, happily, forcibly and beautifully expressed.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By the Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, B. A., Headingly College, Leeds. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

Of the Epistles of the New Testament attributed to St. Paul, that of the Ephesians is the least impassioned and the most abstract. On this and other grounds many serious and able scholars have come to doubt and even to deny that St. Paul wrote it. With these scholars Prof. Findlay is not in sympathy, but on the contrary, he believes that their conclusion "is one of those phenomena which in future histories of religious thought will be quoted as the curiosities of a hypercritical age."

In his Exposition of the Epistle Prof. Findlay shows himself possessed of superior qualities as an exegete. His scholarship is evidently thorough and extensive, his spirit discriminating and judicious, and his style clear, forcible and attractive. His comments, in consequence, are very helpful to a right understanding of what

the Apostle has written in the Epistle under consideration. They are, moreover, very suggestive and rich in profound and impressive thought. The work is accordingly a truly valuable one, and in every respect well worthy of a place in "The Expositor's Bible," to which it belongs. Such works can scarcely fail to promote a sounder knowledge of Scripture and a truer spiritual life, and ought to be generally read and studied.

THE SERMON BIBLE. Acts vii.—1 Corinthians xvi. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

The character of this work has on several occasions been heretofore described in the pages of this REVIEW. It is therefore only necessary here to say that the present volume is possessed of the same characteristics which give their peculiar merit to the preceding volumes of the series. The sketches of sermons contained in it will all be found highly suggestive, and if properly studied will prove serviceable in a homiletical point of view. The references will also be found very valuable and helpful to those who would know what others have said on the portions of Scripture considered.

THE STORY OF THE LIFE OF MACKAY OF UGANDA. Told for Boys. By his Sister. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

In a previous number of this REVIEW we published a notice of the Life of A. M. Mackay, Pioneer Missionary of the Church Missionary Society to Uganda, written by his Sister. The present work, though relating to the same person, and also written by his Sister, it may be well here to state, is an entirely different book, prepared especially to stimulate missionary enthusiasm in the young. The story of Mackay of Uganda, as given in it, is exceedingly interesting and attractive. No one who begins reading it will be likely to lay it permanently aside before he has finished it.

Boys especially will find it captivating and spiritually stimulating and ennobling. It is a book which should find a place in every Sunday-school library. If more of this kind of literature were placed in the hands of boys and girls we should have more noble and heroic men and women; for the ideals which are set before the young have always a great deal to do with their future life. This fact, we fear, is not always regarded as it should be, or there would be more demand than there is for books like the one before us, and less for mere sentimental tales of fiction.



VOL. XIV.

NEW SERIES.

No. 1.

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D. D.,
Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster Pa.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D. D.,
Lancaster, Pa.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

VOLUME XXXIX

JANUARY, 1892.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE,
CHARLES G. FISHER, Proprietor.
807 ARCH STREET.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE.

CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER, 1892.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| ARTICLE I.—What is the Bible? | 5 |
| By Prof. THOS. G. APPLE, D.D. LL.D. | |
| “ II.—“ Ye are Complete in Him.” | 20 |
| By Rev. S. N. CALLENDER, D.D. | |
| “ III —The Inspiration of the Bible. | 34 |
| By Rev. W. RUPP, D.D. | |
| “ IV —The Trend of History. | 64 |
| By Rev. J. B. RUST, A.M | |
| V. —Personal Consecration to Christ. | 93 |
| By Rev J. G. NOSS | |
| “ VI —Sunday Observance. | 106 |
| By Rev. F. K. LEVAN, D.D. | |
| VII —Sinner, Be-!-lona: The Stone and the Rock. | 117 |
| By Mrs. T. C. PORTER. | |
| VIII —Notes of New Books | 138 |

THE
Reformed × Church × Publication × House,

REV. CHAS. G. FISHER, PROPRIETOR,

No. 907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.,

PUBLISHERS, BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS.

Publishers of the Periodicals of the Reformed Church in the United States.

PERIODICALS:

REFORMED CHURCH MESSENGER, Weekly.

\$2 a year.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

\$3 a year.

THE MISSIONARY GUARDIAN, Monthly.

50 cts. a year.

HEIDELBERG TEACHER, Quarterly.

60 cts. single copy; 50 cts. in Clubs.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TREASURY, Semi-monthly.

25 cts. single copy; \$20 per 100 a year.

SUNSHINE, Weekly.

35 cts. single copy; \$25 per 100 a year.

SCHOLAR'S QUARTERLY.

20 cts. single copy; \$10 per 100 a year.

LESSON PAPERS, Advanced and Primary.

Advanced, \$6; Primary, \$7.80 per 100 a year.

Theological Works, Sunday-school Libraries, Sunday-school
Reward Cards, Bibles (Pulpit and Family), Miscella-
neous Books, Stationery of all kinds, etc., etc.

← ALL FURNISHED AT LOWEST CASH PRICES, WITH PROMPTNESS AND DESPATCH. →

ORDERS RESPECTFULLY SOLICITED.

Address,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE,

No. 907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

PROSPECTUS OF THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

The **REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW** was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. In the past thirty years it has suggested the system of philosophy and theology taught in institutions of the Reformed Church located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., where it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature common with the theological quarters of this and other countries. It became (and is or has been) identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportions and established other literary and theological reviews. A great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity as a whole.

In dropping its denominational ties, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. As it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most trusted confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States, and invite to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will cordially labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning, where these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary to the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The **QUARTERLY REVIEW** will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The **REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW** is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D.D. and J. F. Fitch, D.D., assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 130 pages.

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for the views of individual writers.

TERMS:

THREE DOLLARS per year to be paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to the publishers.

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE,

CHARLES C. FISHER, Proprietor.

807 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchange of the **REVIEW**, books for review, and all letters relating to the Editorial Department, must be directed to Thos. G. Apple, D.D., at Lancaster, Pa. The subscription price of the **REVIEW** is \$3.00 per annum in advance.

VOL. XIV

NEW SERIES.

No. 2

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS

THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D.,

Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.



JOHN M. TITZEL, D.D.,

Professor, do.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE

NEW

VOLUME XXXIX

APRIL, 1892.

THE COLLEGE

PUBLISHED BY

CHARLES G. FISHER, PROPRIETOR

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE,

307 ARCH STREET.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE

CONTENTS OF APRIL NUMBER, 1892.

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ARTICLE I.—Christ's Miracles in Relation to His Personality | 147 |
| By the Rev. EML. V. GERHART, D.D., LL.D. | |
| II.—Calvin at Home | 163 |
| By Prof PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. LL.D. | |
| III.—Did Christ Suffer in His Divine Nature | 173 |
| By Rev CORNELIUS R. LANE, D.D., Ph.D. | |
| IV.—The United Presbyterians of Scotland and their New Service Book | 193 |
| By Rev WILLIAM FREDERICK FABER | |
| V.—Is the present Mode of placing Pastors to be Improved? | 204 |
| By Rev A. E. TRUXAL, A.M | |
| VI.—Anglo-Catholic Movement | 223 |
| By Rev JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER | |
| VII.—The Ideal Church | 235 |
| By Rev. A. A. PFANSTIEHL. | |
| VIII.—The Stone and the Rock | 254 |
| By MRS. T. C. PORTER. | |
| IX.—New Books | 271 |

VOL. XIV.

NEW SERIES.

No. 3.

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D. D.,
Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster Pa.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D. D.,
Lancaster, Pa.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

VOLUME XXXIX.

JULY, 1892.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY

CHARLES G. FISHER, Proprietor of
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE,
907 ARCH STREET.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE.

CONTENTS OF JULY NUMBER, 1892

- ARTICLE I The Divine-Human Person in Christ
By Prof THOS G APPLE, DD, LL D
- " II —Original Buddhism .
By Prof E V GERHART, DD, LL D
- " III —Samuel Giddin, Pietist and Pioneer
By Rev J H DUBBS, DD
- " IV —The Pentateuch
Reviewed by H P. LAIRD Esq.
- " V.—Christ's Headship and Sonship
By the late Rev S H GIESY DD
- " VI The Mystery of Evil in the Natural World
By Rev SAMUEL Z. BEAM D.D
- VII —Jesus Christ, The Greatest Reformer
By Rev A S WEBER, A.M
- " VIII —Christianity a Life
By the Rev AMBROSE M SCHMIDT
- " IX —Notices of New Books .

VOL. XIV.

NEW SERIES.

No. 4.

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS

THOMAS G. APPLE, D. D.,

Professor of Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D. D.,

Editor.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE

OF SIN AND SATAN.

OCTOBER, 1892.

NEW YORK:

THE REFORMED PUBLISHING HOUSE,

101 NASSAU ST., COR. ANN ST.

AND S. W. 4TH ST.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE.

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER NUMBER, 1892.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| ARTICLE I.—The Educational Problem | 421 |
| By JOHN STAHR, D.D. | |
| " II.—The Inspiration of the Scriptures | 437 |
| By the Rev TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D. | |
| " III.—Modern Biblical Criticism | 461 |
| By Rev. A. A. PFANSTIEHL. | |
| " IV.—The Importance of the Objective and Sacramental in Christianity | 473 |
| By Rev J. W. LOVE, A.M. | |
| V.—The Origin and Development of the Idea of Sacrifices | 487 |
| By Rev D. B. LADY, A.M. | |
| VI.—Theology and Music in Christian Wor- ship | 504 |
| By Rev J. M. SCHICK, D.D. | |
| VII.—The Essential Sonship | 522 |
| by the late Rev Samuel H. GIESY, D.D. | |
| VIII.—The Church: The Stone and the Rock | 536 |
| By Mrs T. C. PORTER. | |
| IX.—New Books | 556 |

THE
Reformed × Church × Publication × House,

REV. CHAS. G. FISHER, PROPRIETOR,

No. 907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.,

PUBLISHERS, BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS.

Publishers of the Periodicals of the Reformed Church in the United States.

PERIODICALS:

REFORMED CHURCH MESSENGER, Weekly.

\$2 a year.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

\$3 a year.

THE MISSIONARY GUARDIAN, Monthly.

50 cts. a year.

HEIDELBERG TEACHER, Quarterly.

60 cts. single copy; 50 cts. in Clubs.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TREASURY, Semi-monthly.

25 cts. single copy; \$20 per 100 a year.

SUNSHINE, Weekly.

35 cts. single copy; \$25 per 100 a year.

SCHOLAR'S QUARTERLY.

20 cts. single copy; \$10 per 100 a year.

LESSON PAPERS, Advanced and Primary.

Advanced, \$6; Primary, \$7.80 per 100 a year.

**Theological Works, Sunday-school Libraries, Sunday-school
Reward Cards, Bibles (Pulpit and Family), Miscella-
neous Books, Stationery of all kinds, etc., etc.**

← ALL FURNISHED AT LOWEST CASH PRICES, WITH PROMPTNESS AND DESPATCH. →

ORDERS RESPECTFULLY SOLICITED.

Address,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE,

No. 907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

The MERCEBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and theological institutions, while great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological Quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most recent confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it will discharge its literary duty from all in that Church who hold to the same doctrinal basis, notwithstanding differences in their logical views.

But we are not to lose sight of our general relationship and character. It will be remembered that the Mercersburg school was a school of science and theology, and not of philosophy and theology in general. Taking for its motto the words "Theology in its broadest sense," it will be in sympathy with the feeling that "theology is not a narrow, exclusive, and arbitrary system, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all the various sciences and departments of knowledge may be found in the theological domain, these sciences may be brought into a harmonious agreement with the theological domain." The REVIEW will, therefore, be in sympathy with the feeling that the Reformed Church is growing power in the Church of Christ, and that the Reformed Church needs a theological Review, it will welcome contributions from all who are in sympathy with the Reformed Church, believing that science and literature will be brought into a harmonious agreement with the theological domain.

The REVIEW is published by Thos. G. Apple, D.D., at No. 100 N. 3rd St., Philadelphia, Pa. It is published quarterly, in April, July and October of each year. Each volume contains three numbers. The REVIEW is not responsible for the views of individual writers.

Subscriptions should be sent in advance. The names of six new subscribers, with the amount of their subscription, are to be sent direct to the

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION HOUSE.

THOS. G. APPLE, Proprietor.

100 N. 3rd St., Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Editors of the REVIEW are for notice, and all letters relating to the REVIEW should be sent to Thos. G. Apple, D.D., at Lancaster, Pa. Manuscripts in



1



